

059139

JPRS 82515

22 December 1982

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1346

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19990831 140

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

3
63
A04

22 December 1982

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1346

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL

Conservative Business Circles' Influence in Reagan Administration Examined (Ernst Genri; ZNAMYA, Jul 82)	1
Military Parity With U.S. Essential for Peace Despite Cost (Boris Vesnin; NEW TIMES, Nov 82)	30
S.E. Asian Experience Shows Evils of Capitalist Economic Development (APN DAILY REVIEW, 29 Nov 82)	36
U.S. Involvement in Greek Colonels' Seizure of Power Alleged (APN DAILY REVIEW, 2 Dec 82)	37
Important Themes for 37th UN General Assembly Session Surveyed (Vl. Petrov; PRAVDA, 20 Sep 82)	39
Soviet-Afghan Seminar on Central Asian Culture Held in Dushanbe (Editorial Report)	43
New Publishing House Established To Translate Russian, Foreign Works (Editorial Report)	43
Japanese Attention to Central Asian Development Reported in Tajik Paper (Editorial Report)	43
Soviet-Afghan Archaeological Work in Northern Afghanistan Reported (Editorial Report)	43
Soviet Finnish Theater Celebrates 50th Anniversary (Editorial Report)	44
French Scholar Attacked for Writings on Worker, Peasant Access to Education (Editorial Report)	44

Briefs	
FRG Medical Instrument Manufacturers in Baku	45

NATIONAL

New Work on Party's Struggle Against Nationalism (Editorial Report)	46
Role of Literary Executors in Country Described (Editorial Report)	46
Drobizheva Praises New York on Multinational Soviet Working Class (Editorial Report)	47
Rerikh Collection of Oriental Art on Display in Moscow (Editorial Report)	47

REGIONAL

Uzbek Minister Discusses Contribution in Nonchernozem (I. Dzhurabekov; PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN', Aug 82)	48
Agricultural Development Viewed by Latvian Academy of Sciences (SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 1 Oct 82)	53
New Scientific Economics Society Created in Tajikistan (Editorial Report)	58
Tajik Women's Journal Celebrates 50th Anniversary (Editorial Report)	58
New Tajik-Language Book on Struggle With Basmachi Published (Editorial Report)	58
Tradition Family Pattern Retained in Central Asian Academic Family (Editorial Report)	58
Television Service Expanded Into Tyan' Shan Region (Editorial Report)	59
Gorno-Badakhshan City Celebrates 50th Anniversary (Editorial Report)	59
Muslim Nationalities Sweep Hero-Mother Awards in Turkmenia (Editorial Report)	59

INTERNATIONAL

CONSERVATIVE BUSINESS CIRCLES' INFLUENCE IN REAGAN ADMINISTRATION EXAMINED

Moscow ZNAMYA in Russian No 7, Jul 82 pp 180-202

[Article by Ernst Genri: "Behind the Doors of the White House"]

[Text] The 40th President

Today such tension as, it can be said, has not existed since war times, reigns in the world. Everyone senses this. The United States is feverishly stockpiling weapons of the most abominable types. During the next 5-year period in Washington it is envisaged to spend for these purposes more than \$1.5 trillion--much more than both world wars taken together cost all powers.

The Pentagon is preparing to turn Europe into a nuclear battlefield, threatening the very existence of the continent. The proposals of the socialist countries to put an end to this madness are being ignored. Newspapers are writing about the possibility of the collapse of civilization. Who seriously thought of such a thing a few years ago?

The people in the West are worried. Antiwar demonstrations, in which hundreds of thousands and even millions of people are participating, are being held in the cities of Western Europe. At the same time neofascists, revanchists, American ultramilitarists and professional anticommunists in various countries are attempting to add fuel to the fire. Somewhere far to the east the Asian hegemonists are impatiently awaiting the collapse of Europe. Meanwhile in the West the economic crisis continues to intensify.

Is the picture too gloomy? No, it is the real situation. The capitalist world in the 1980's is really in a fever. What is behind all this?

One thing is first of all clear to everyone who follows events closely: the epicenter of the upheavals is beyond the ocean, around the White House in Washington. The strongest currents, which are increasing the tension on the international arena, are obviously originating there. Not one serious observer, no matter what views he may hold, can doubt this.

From a book being prepared for publication by Izdatel'stvo Agenstva pechati Novosti.

But this is only the beginning of the explanation of the essence of the matter. What is behind the doors of the White House? Who is prompting Ronald Reagan?

Indeed, where is the 40th U.S. President leading America and the western world? Why is he pursuing such an aggressive, dangerously explosive policy? How could this former movie actor, who for decades played in Hollywood the roles of gangsters, cunning businessmen, seducers and adventurers, become the head of the most powerful capitalist state? What is the secret of his dizzying career, which in actual fact is similar to a Hollywood adventure film?

It is not simply that the most anti-Soviet-minded figures of the United States, who are attempting to disguise the glaring aggressiveness of current American foreign policy, are solidly behind him. The point also is that the oligarchic groups, which are not mentioned in congressional debates, but actually prevail in the country, in recent times have been changed in Washington. All these groups are involved in the production of weapons of mass destruction, deriving unprecedented superprofits, but each is striving to overtake the other, to place the White House under its invisible control and thereby to obtain the opportunity to dictate policy in its own way.

It is not to be doubted that at this time the keys to the White House are in the hands of what is called the "California" oligarchic group, which previously had yielded first place to the billionaires of Wall Street in the eastern part of the country. This group stands on the extreme right flank of the American imperialist bourgeoisie. Ronald Reagan is its direct plenipotentiary, and this is almost not concealed.

In 1981 a sharp turn of American policy in the direction of the aggravation of the international situation and the sharp step-up of the arms race was made by the efforts of Reagan and his associates. It can be asserted that the main problems of American diplomacy in recent times have been solved no longer only in Washington, but also in San Francisco, the capital of the California financial group.

Much less is known about it than about other oligarchic groups of the United States--the Rockefellers, the Morgans, the Mellons and the du Ponts. Although it has existed for more than seven decades now, its current ascent began only after World War II, when the aircraft, shipbuilding, steelmaking, and then the missile industry began to grow rapidly in the Far West of the United States.

Since that time the California group has accumulated such wealth and has so strengthened its influence, that now it is quite capable of being compared with the Rockefellers and the Morgans if not with respect to its capital, then with respect to its political activeness. Hence, too, the sensational career of Reagan, which has amazed many.

This career as if actually began on the movie screen. But it should not be forgotten that a significant portion of the 50 movies, in which Reagan was filmed, were made with the money of the very same California financial group headed by the Bank of America in San Francisco, which subsequently made him the President of the United States.

Precisely it "reared" him. But it must be admitted that he himself knew well how to play and for whom. He began his debut in politics with the fact that he loudly declared California "the most American America" and Californians people of a special mold, who are showing the way not only to the United States, but also to the entire world. This immediately drew him nearer both to the local narrow-minded public and especially to big business of the state, which needed publicity for its political goals.

"I am very proud of California," Reagan once declared in a newspaper interview. "This is a classical example of the development of free (private--E. G.) initiative.... With our population of 20 million we are producing as many goods and services as 100 million Japanese are creating. We provide 40 percent of all the vegetables and fruit which Americans eat. We provide a large portion of the aircraft and missiles, which go to arm the United States...."

Facing not the Atlantic, but the Pacific Ocean, Reagan hinted, California had become all but an independent country with vast global interests, even something in the nature of "a piece of the 21st century." Such claims boded many a thing.

When in 1966 Reagan was nominated by the California magnates for the position of governor of the state, his opponent, the former governor and Democratic Party candidate Brown, asked him on a television broadcast the following tricky questions: "How will you, an actor who has no government experience, govern the largest state?" Reagan responded: "I have played the roles of kings, so I will somehow cope with the role of governor."

The chairman of the "finance committee," which was created at that time in San Francisco to support Reagan's candidacy, was none other than Henry Salvatore--a businessman from the group of the powerful California Bank of America and director of the large California military monopoly Litton Industries. Long before Reagan's nomination, at one of the meetings of the millionaires, Salvatore proposed a toast to him as the "future president" of the United States. Everything was ready long before 1981.

Thus this figure became the ruler of the state. The subsequent path upward was henceforth cleared for him.

Since that time Reagan never broke the close tie with the California millionaires, particularly the Pentagon contractors. In his gubernatorial "economic report" for 1968 it was stated: "California to a great extent is involved in the activity stemming from the Vietnam war. Owing to the great importance of the defense and space industry our state has developed into the most important source of new arms for the waging of modern warfare. The number of workers in the aerospace industry in 1967 increased by another 48,000 and continues to grow. This industry accounts for more than a third of our output...."

By this Ronald Reagan said very much about himself, about his policy and, as it turned out, about his future. The main thing for him was and is the production of "superweapons." Today he is putting his ideals into practice not within the state of California, but on the scale of the entire United States, acting in this case just as strictly and recklessly as he did at one time on the screen. This is not a president like Franklin Roosevelt or if only John Kennedy, but a figure of a different mold.

It is worth adding a few words about his personality. This, as is known, is always important for the appraisal of a high-ranking political figure.

American newspapers and magazines, a number of which treat him quite sarcastically, frequently are not sparing of poignant details concerning his character. It is stressed, for example, that Reagan is extremely vain. He does not wear glasses, so as not to spoil his appearance. He checks his horoscope daily. One liberal Republican congressman noted about Reagan back when he was governor of California: "You can get to the very bottom of his mentality without getting your ankles wet." He himself said with pride: "I am not smart enough to lie."

This was also said not unintentionally. The President is showing off. As NEWSWEEK magazine expressed it, the people close to Reagan admit that he "sometimes bears his 'unaffectedness' as a mask and even as armor." This is also from his former occupation.

The political arena for him in reality is as if the same thing as the movie screen, on which he stood out vividly at one time, and he speaks to the public now as an important strategist, now as a daring cowboy on a horse at his estate, now as "a simply good guy." He is playing all the time, he is also playing when he is making threatening anti-Soviet statements. His passion for sensational international adventures is explained not only by the desire to fulfill the will of the imperialist center, but also by the same penchant for external effects and posing. The journalists who attend his press conferences know this and grin. But he rules 230 million people.

Reagan, apparently, is not very interested in real culture. According to stories of his people, the books in his library were at one time arranged by a decorator and since then have been carefully protected from dust. Here, it is true, he is following the example of his teacher, the old leader of the right-wing Republicans, Barry Goldwater, who in his youth in general almost did not read books.

He is constantly attacking communism, but hardly knows well what this is. But in the past he took a most active part in the persecution of communists, by assisting the draconic U.S. Senate commission for the investigation of "un-American activity," and in the investigation of "reds" among his colleagues. Now he is calling detente "an illusion" and SALT-2 "a poor deal for the United States." His real face and purpose are also revealed here.

Here is the portrait painted back before his election to the White House by A. Alan Post, an expert of the political world in the United States: "I am scared to death that they will elect him. What worries me is that he is such a superficial person. He is an actor. He speaks six or eight times a day, saying always the same words, reading from his notebook.... It looks as if the conditioned reflex is characteristic of him, as with Pavlov's dogs."

Post is not entirely correct, he underestimates the role of Reagan. Precisely such standardized official political leaders are needed by modern imperialists, by those who actually manage the entire matter from behind a screen.

Acting is an honorable occupation. But does any actor have the right, even on the instructions of his directors, to play with the life of mankind?

Who is ruling the United States along with Reagan?

It is sufficient to look at the list of the members of the current American Government to be convinced: the Reagan Administration resembles more the board of a bank or a military-industrial corporation than the higher organs of the state. Capital and governmental power here have actually merged into a single whole.

Indeed, it is not that simple to reveal this in all instances. The monopolists, when they need to, know how to observe exclusive secrecy. Some of the members of the Reagan Government are disguised in such a way that an ordinary person can hardly recognize immediately their essence.

Current U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Donald Regan, previously the head of the New York brokerage firm of Merrill Lynch and deputy chairman of the New York Stock Exchange, can serve as an example. On the surface he does not differ by anything special from an ordinary broker. But his advantage from the point of view of the circles now in power in Washington consists precisely in this.

Regan deals professionally with helping the magnates of capital conceal their affairs. He has powerful clients, but who they are remains unknown. Meanwhile in one 5-year period alone--from 1950 to 1955, for example, his firm placed securities of corporations in the amount of \$897 million.

Once an incident occurred, which disturbed even the businessmen on Wall Street. The firm of Merrill Lynch became the largest stockholder of one American electric power enterprise. In conformity with the law information concerning for whom these stocks were purchased, was demanded from it. The response stated: "Merrill Lynch informs that, in its opinion, the meeting of the demand of the registering clerk concerning information with respect to the names of the owners, who are deriving revenues from the above-mentioned stocks, would be a violation of the confidence placed in this firm by its clients."

In other words, no matter what the law might say, no one in America has the right to find out for whom the firm of Merrill Lynch is acting, if it does not wish to tell. In this way much can be concealed.

For whom is the Secretary of the Treasury in the Reagan Government, a stock market specialist in backstage deals, working? This, apparently, also remains his secret, although it is now no longer a question of stocks, but of politics. What American financial dynasty does he represent in the government, while being in charge as Secretary of the Treasury of the extortion of taxes from the population for the payment for unprecedented arms? This is not being reported to the people.

What kind of person is current American Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger?

He is another as if not entirely distinct figure who holds a most important post. Indeed, his "California" roots do not give rise to doubts. Weinberger began his career as a lawyer in San Francisco, later became the chairman of the Republican Party Central Committee in the state of California, even later, under Nixon, the director of a government budget office and Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. When Reagan occupied the position of governor of California, Weinberger was made director of the state department of finance, that is, he entered the immediate milieu of the future president.

"I am a conservative and am proud to bear such a label," Weinberger said. He is also a staunch militarist. During the years of the Nixon government he sent the president a memorandum, in which he already advised at that time that the appropriations for military purposes not be cut, but be increased.

It is also well known that Weinberger is a frequent guest at what is called the Owl's Nest, a club of 400 millionaires, who meet weekly in a grove not far from San Francisco and discuss there the main lines of American policy. One of the "cabins" in this grove belongs to Ronald Reagan.

But Weinberger previously did not have anything to do with important military matters, except for his views. He is not a general, he once completed the war with the rank of captain in the intelligence directorate of the staff of the ultra-reactionary MacArthur in the Far East. His predecessor in the chair of Secretary of Defense, H. Brown, was considered at least a specialist in neutron weapons. Weinberger was not received well at the Pentagon. It would seem that this is a person who had chosen for himself an especially civilian field of activity.

Meanwhile, immediately after he assumed the position of Secretary of Defense, Weinberger developed a truly frantic enthusiasm, lauding the neutron bomb. In just 1 day in August 1981, for example, he granted on this theme seven television interviews, spoke at a press conference and published an article in a newspaper. In case of a "crisis," he reported, neutron weapons can be delivered to Europe "in a few hours." "I do not see," he stressed another time, "why we should not be ready for military operations in at least two places at the same time" (apparently, simultaneously on several continents). Not many of his predecessors at the Pentagon permitted themselves to speak in such a threatening tone even during critical days.

According to reports of the American press, Weinberger continues to behave so aggressively that he is causing irritation even for General Haig. Nevertheless he obviously enjoys the special confidence of his old friend Reagan. At present Weinberger is just about the most influential figure in the Washington Cabinet. It is characteristic that he made Carlucci, former deputy director of the CIA, his deputy.

What is the secret of the career of Weinberger, a figure about whom in broad circles until quite recently hardly anything was known? It is not difficult to guess this secret. Prior to being appointed Secretary of Defense, Weinberger was vice president of the Bechtel Corporation, which belongs to the Bechtel family, California multimillionaires who made a fortune on government orders back during the years of World War II. Now this family is not standing out. But a companion of the Bechtels--and thereby of Weinberger--is none other than J. A. McCown, former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force and a former executive of the CIA.

This explains many a thing. American intelligence under McCown set many records with respect to secret subversive acts. In spite of some leaders of the Democratic Party, who proposed to limit the rights of the CIA, McCown was granted powers which exceeded even the rights of one of his famous predecessors, the all-powerful Allen Dulles.

When McCown was made a head of the CIA, the New York liberal magazine THE NEW REPUBLIC wrote that he is notable for "an obsession with hatred for communism and revolutionary changes.... If organizing abilities and hatred for communism are everything necessary for a leader of an intelligence administration, McCown is suited for this position. But this is insufficient. To give him such power is just the same as assigning a person with poor vision to drive a powerful motor vehicle or bringing in a tuner who does not have an ear for music."

The firm of the Bechtels and McCown, in which the current U.S. Secretary of Defense is involved, specializes in the construction of air force bases and is performing work in hundreds of countries. Its turnover is estimated in the hundreds of millions of dollars. In 1976 and 1979-1980 it contributed considerable amounts to the Reagan campaign fund. This, undoubtedly, turned out to be a good capital investment for it. It can only be added that at one time this firm developed with the assistance of credits from the Bank of America. It is not surprising that its man is now in charge of the Pentagon. A "madman" in his own place.

Is there a mask on the face of the Secretary of State in the Reagan government, the current leader of American diplomacy A. Haig? Yes, there is: he has a quite transparent one. First of all Haig, of course, is a representative of the Pentagon. He is the former supreme commander of NATO armed forces and U.S. armed forces in Europe, and even earlier the favorite of Nixon on the National Security Council. Already at that time Haig did everything to complicate the international situation and to turn Western Europe into a nuclear missile base of the United States. He was the NATO military commander who attempted in every possible way to expedite the conclusion of a direct military alliance between the United States and the PRC for the purpose of squeezing the Soviet Union from the west and east. He is also known for the fact that he called the national liberation movement of oppressed peoples "international terrorism."

In any case Haig does not miss occasions to aggravate the relations between the West and the East and to make difficult the negotiations on the limitation of the arms race. He almost does not conceal this. Detente and the parity of the USSR and the United States in the military area are, in his words, "a mirage of rhetoric."

Such is the face of General Haig, which is visible to all. Is he an extreme militarist? Unquestionably, but not only that. Having returned to private life after retiring from the position of supreme commander of NATO armed forces, Haig took a step which did not attract particular attention of the public at large: he became Chairman of the Board of the American corporation, United Technologies. Thereby he nevertheless removed the mask for a time. The ultramilitarist also turned out to be a participant in big business. In 1 year in this position, according to reports of the American press, he became a millionaire.

United Technologies is not a California corporation. It belongs to the group of the Morgans and du Ponts, which competes with the California magnates on the arms market and frequently even supports not the Republican, but the Democratic Party. But this does not mean that the magnates of the military-industrial complex, when they need to, do not act in concert. Reagan could not venture to exclude completely from his government the influential group of billionaires, which could overthrow

* The report on Haig's resignation was received when this issue was being printed.

him in the next election. Haig now obviously represents the military-industrial complex as a whole, as well as the Pentagon. Washington diplomacy is under the thumb of both.

In 1979 United Technologies has a turnover of \$9,053,000,000 and on the list of suppliers of the Pentagon with respect to weapons of mass destruction was in first place. The next few years will show, to what figure Reagan's Department of State will be able to increase its turnover. Such are some of Reagan's most influential favorites. If we calculated the capital which is just behind them personally, and not in the broad political sense, a figure exceeding many tens of billions of dollars would be obtained. But for the forces ruling the United States this alone is already a quite important criterion.

The Largest Bank in the World

Who actually dominates in California, of which Reagan acts as the champion? Every unbiassed Californian would respond to this question: the gigantic Bank of America in San Francisco and the California military-industrial group connected with it.

Indeed, the Bank of America is today the largest bank in the capitalist world. Its resources in 1980 came to \$106.7 billion, the deposits of clients came to \$86 billion, greatly exceeding the resources of the main banks belonging to the Rockefellers and Morgans. In 34 years--from 1945 to 1979--its assets increased by more than 20-fold. Such a thing does not happen frequently with banks, even American banks.

In present-day California the phrase "Bank of America" is the law, and without its assistance Reagan could never have become not only the President of the United States, but also governor of the state. The entire state machinery of California from top to bottom and the entire staff of the Republican Party are in the hands of this group of businessmen.

The bank has existed since 1904, for 78 years--according to the norms of traditional financial capital not that long of a time. During this time it has been able to surpass all its rivals. It can be said that the rapid growth of the Bank of America reflected more than the others the unique dynamism which until quite recently was characteristic of American capitalism. Reagan knew on whom to rely.

Resources of the Leading American Banks
(millions of dollars)

	<u>1945</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1979</u>
Bank of America (California group)	5038	12787	58710	106273
Chase Manhattan Bank (Rockefellers)	4965	9720	41423	64114
Morgan Guaranty Trust (Morgans)	4170*	4982	25545	42285

The history of the Bank of America to this day is colored with some mystery. It is known that an Italian immigrant by the name of Amadeo Giannini, who in his youth engaged in small-scale trade in sheep and fruit, was its founder. It is doubtless, however, that someone at the very beginning helped him to set up his business. There

* An approximate figure, which combines the resources of the Guaranty Trust and the Morgan bank, which existed separately at that time.

are grounds to suggest that it was the powerful Jesuit Order, which in California watched over numerous Italian and Irish Catholics, and that precisely the Jesuits, who are interested in politics even more than in religion, and who have significant monetary assets, to this day patronize the Bank of America.

Apparently, Catholic priests, while pursuing their church's own goals, assisted Giannini in establishing contacts with small depositors--farmers and retail merchants. It is also confirmed by the fact that the richest Italian-Californian family, the di Giorgio family, which is closely connected with the Giannini family, also succeeded by means of Jesuit money.

The American bourgeois press, which pushes the Bank of America, is silent about these matters, but they are undoubtedly of considerable importance. For if it is possible to consider the Jesuit Order to some extent to be a member--be it even a secret one--of the California oligarchic group, much in its magical ascent becomes clearer. Amadeo Giannini would hardly have been able to create his own financial stronghold without support on the part of influential clerical circles.

Indeed, the very nature of California--its mild climate, which is conducive to the influx of inhabitants, its exceptionally fertile soil, which ensures the record productivity of agriculture, its very rich mineral resources and its proximity to the Pacific Ocean and thereby also to Asia, which affords extensive opportunities for foreign trade--in many ways helped his bank.

Moreover, the cheapness of manpower played a most important role here. For decades destitute immigrants from Italy, China, Japan, the Philippines and Mexico, who were willing to work for the lowest pay, if only to find a refuge, thronged in masses to the American Far West, to the vast territories. They were exploited as, perhaps, in no other state of the United States. Nevertheless the state of California, which at the beginning of this century held 21st place in the United States in the size of the population, in this respect is now in first place.

The group of financiers from the Bank of America was also the main one of all the California exploiters. At first what is called "shrimp catching": the hunting for the savings and property of small depositors, was its specialty. This was easily done.

The bank entered into relations with people who previously had never dealt with banks. It gave small-scale merchants loans for interest which was twofold greater than the ordinary interest, and when the debtors were unable to make ends meet, it got hold of their businesses. This was called "business with the little man," and this bewildered the old financial giants on Wall Street.

"A. P. Giannini," M. and B. James, the in-house biographers of the bank, subsequently wrote, "was the greatest innovator in modern banking. Morgan was a banker for very rich people or for very rich associations (monopolies--E. G.).... Giannini was willing to speak with anybody. While the Bank of America was rising, the house of Morgan was left behind.... Morgan probably turned over in his grave."

Thus the "little man" with his business (but, of course, not the ordinary worker) accumulated enormous wealth for the bank. Special departments were set up in the bank for serving each of the large number of national minorities which inhabit

California. At the same time the game was also played at the expense of consumers. When, for example, the Bank of America and other creditors created the California Grape Growers' Association, it was immediately suggested to the farmers, for the purpose of increasing the prices for grapes, to leave half of their crop standing.

Well-known American writer Cary McWilliams back before World War II wrote in his book "Factories in the Field": "When you imagine that approximately 50 percent of the farmlands in Central and Northern California are controlled by one institution--the Bank of America--the bitterness of these poor little people, who are protecting their businesses from cheats, becomes clear."

The little people of California grew poor, the bank of Giannini became the most profitable in the capitalist world. Its net profit at times exceeded \$100 million a year. Tens of thousands of farmers were left tied to it by debt. In California alone in the 1960's it has 850 branches.

On the other hand, the bank attempted also to lay its hands on the film making of Hollywood, which had flourished in the state and also yields enormous profits. The well-known movie director Cecil B. De Mille was made vice president of one of the branch banks, and such famous actors as Charles Chaplin, Mary Pickford and Douglas Fairbanks paid for the loans received from Giannini with their participation in movies.

The California group was now not concealing the fact that it intended to surpass Wall Street. Here cheap regional demagoguery was used. "The California people will rise fully armed against the control of Wall Street," Amadeo Giannini himself declared. "Wall Street attempted to hold on a string the enterprises of the west coast and wanted them to go pay their respects to it in New York. These times have now passed," Giannini, Jr., said after his father. It became known that the group of the Morgans was attempting to scuttle the rival bank from within. But this attempt ended in failure.

What is more, it turned out that the exploitation of agriculture, trade and the movie industry in flourishing California was only the beginning for the Bank of America. When World War II broke out, an enormous defense industry began to grow in the state, as if from under the ground, and the group of Giannini also headed the business here, by financing local Pentagon contractors.

The largest defense corporations, which grew richer with each day--Lockheed, Rockwell International (the former name was North American Aviation), Douglas, Litton, Hughes, the steelmaking and shipbuilding monopoly of Edgar Kaiser, the shipbuilding concern of the Bechtels and others--entered its orbit. In 1943 the employment at aircraft enterprises of California has increased as compared with 1939 by more than 12-fold.

Such a thing did not occur in any other state of the United States, and everything to a considerable extent was supported by the credits opened by the bank of Giannini. In the 1970's one worker in three in the state was employed at defense plants. At the same time the threads were stretched to the petroleum concerns of Getty and Hoover, Jr., son of the former president of the United States, which had newly arisen in the state. The war in Korea, the war in Vietnam, and then the arms race, which was newly intensified by the United States and was aimed against the

USSR, provided the California group no longer with tens and even hundreds of millions of dollars in revenues, but billions of dollars.

Henceforth the political course of the Bank of America was finally decided. Anti-Sovietism of an extreme bent became the motive force which first of all directed this entire enormous amount of concentrated capital. Local bourgeois politicians, who longed for a career, began one after the other to join the clientele and circle of the bank, supporting the right wing of the Republican Party. Giannini himself became the buttress of this wing, although at first he availed himself of the services of the ruling politicians of the Democratic Party of the state.

It is characteristic that the founder of the Bank of America was not far from pro-fascist views. He was considered an ardent admirer of Mussolini and back in 1923, soon after Il Duce came to power, spent several months in Italy. In Milan Giannini purchased the Bank of Meridian Italy, which immediately began to help the Fascists to develop their economy. When in 1928 Giannini came again to Italy, this caused an increase of the exchange rates on the Milan Exchange.

Another thing is also known. Back in 1921 a special "Russian department" for serving the White Guards who had fled to California was created in the Bank of America. K. Shanovskiy, the long-time representative of the tsarist government in California, became the head of the department. Obviously, in San Francisco they felt disposed to overthrow the Soviet regime. Thus, 60 years ago it was possible to consider the California group to be anti-Soviet and reactionary.

Thus the Bank of America became a kind of imperialist "superbank," the headquarters of a new financial empire in the United States, which seized with strong hands the most active state of the country and incited the United States to global aggression. The transformation of its bank into the supreme world bank became the dream of this group of businessmen.

An enormous shadow, which falls on the globe, of a gentleman with a hat on and a briefcase in his hand, a shadow which covers several continents, is depicted on the emblem of the Bank of America, which symbolizes its might. Near by is a map of the world with hundreds of squares, stars, circles and triangles--the branches of the bank in nearly all the countries of the capitalist world. "The man from the Bank of America covers the entire globe," the text reads.

In the book of California journalist Harold Gilliam about San Francisco it is said: "The tomorrow of our world is there, in the west (the Far West of the United States--E. G.). It is coming into view beyond the horizon, where the sun sets. Historical forces, the titanic might and gigantic scale of this shore will create it. Its symbol, which is visible for eyes, is this gate at the end of the continent. In this era of the Pacific Ocean the San Francisco Bay will be the bay of fate."

This is the same thing as appears on the emblem of the Bank of America, and almost word for word what current U.S. President Ronald Reagan declared back when he was the governor of California. The idea is the same, a reckless idea: as was already said, to transform the California bank into a hegemonic force of the world. In the America of our times such designs are also possible.

All the data confirm that the California group has indeed become the exponent of the ideas of the extreme, most aggressive wing of American imperialism. Even Presidents Kennedy and Carter, from their point of view, were insufficiently strong and decisive. It has felt restricted for the long time now in the United States itself. Hence its extolled "global policy."

The more rapidly the capital of the Bank of America and the military-industrial corporations associated with it grows, the more irrepressible their aspiration for global expansion is and the more aggressive their policy is with respect to those who stand in their way.

Genuine peaceful coexistence is unacceptable for such imperialists. The thought of a world nuclear war does not stop them. It is not reason, but the rate of return that governs their thinking. Racist insanity moved Hitler, the frenzied thirst for money and, besides that, the dread of the decline of the influence of the United States in the modern world and the fate of world capitalism moved the California imperialists. Figures like Reagan were educated in this school, and they do not have other views, another ideology.

The current board of the Bank of America, which consists of 32 people, is a kind of private club of multimillionaires. E. W. Clausen, the present chairman of the International Monetary Fund, who was charged with spending assets of the United Nations for loans to member countries, until recently was in charge. Such industrial magnates as the second richest person in the world, J. P. Getty, who had a fortune in the amount of \$1.0-1.2 billion dollars and very large oil wells, the owner of a California steelmaking trust and an aluminum trust, E. F. Kaiser (capital of \$350-500 million), the founder of the California defense corporation of Litton Industries, R. L. Ash, president of the petroleum concern of Standard Oil of California J. R. Gray and other businessmen of the same rank sit, or sat, next to him.

A place on the board has also been allotted to several bosses of "California culture," for example, the publisher of the San Francisco right-wing newspaper THE TIMES MIRROR, F. D. Murphy, and the head of the animated film firm Walt Disney Productions, D. B. Teottamu.

It cannot be said that these people are the ideological leaders of the American bourgeoisie. But they certainly constitute the general staff of California big business, which dreams not only of constantly dominating in the United States, but also of sooner or later taking under its control even Europe and Asia.

This is not an exaggeration. Reality confirms that when the revenues of modern monopolists come to the billions of dollars, they lose the sense of reality, and not only in the area of business, but also in politics.

They are becoming more hate-filled and aggressive than the feudal robber princes once were. Like the latter, they are willing to agree to anything to achieve their goals. But even the Hapsburgs, the Hohenstaufens, the Bourbons and the Hohenzollerns did not bring themselves to such reckless adventures at the expense of the life of millions of people as the current Shylocks from the Bank of America.

Such are the people who hold sway in present-day California. What is being done under their domination in the state itself, in this marvellous corner of the world, which was given to Americans by nature?

Local journalist Remi Nadeau entitled his book "California: The New Society." "What America is becoming, California has already become," he wrote. "If the ideal Californians are our new society, it is possible to call it antisocial.... California society according to its concept is a society in which the horizontal ties between its members have been lost, and they have been replaced by a large number of vertical ties which run in only one direction: from the top down--from those who guide it to the public at large."

What is conspicuous in this society, which is controlled by the bank? The prospering of the residents, who are called upon to bless such power? No, it is something else. "California newspapers," wrote Soviet correspondent G. Ratiani, who visited California, "are larded with reports that this state surpasses the other states in the number of crimes, especially those committed by young people, and in the number of suicides, that it has become all but the world center of dirty publications. Fancies of such types, who walk about freely with a swastika on their sleeve, are published...."

Is there at least some order in this "new society"? Yes, there is. "In Beverly Hills in Los Angeles," G. Ratiani continued, "they arrested a French actress who had come to be filmed in an American movie. In the mornings she walked along the street for exercise. Since in this district of movie stars and wealthy people no one goes walking about the streets, the people decided that this French woman was staking out some luxurious villa to rob."

The commentary of a local television commentator on this case was: "Such a thing can happen only in California!" It is worth adding that Ronald Reagan began to govern California as the governor of the state at approximately that time.

Some peculiar psychology also characterizes many people who belong to the upper stratum of California's plutocratic society. When in August 1981 Samuel T. (Kohen), a physicist in the service of the military-industrial complex and inventor of the neutron bomb, who lives in California, was asked: "Does making weapons give you pleasure?", he responded: "Honestly speaking, it does. It is a challenge. A very appealing business." He asked his daughter, who was present there: "What would you say about the fact that your father invented the bomb?" The daughter responded: "It is absolutely all the same to me." (Kohen) added: "I find that all people are repulsive. Whoever does not actually kill, would willingly kill." He was asked the question: "In this connection, in the past 20 years has the thought if only once entered your head: 'Oh my God, what have I invented?'" (Kohen's) response: "No, never."

So they think.

It is possible to argue about what to call the society which has been created in this state under the aegis of the directors of the Bank of America: a "vertical" society or an antisociety. The latter, it seems, is more accurate.

But what specifically is behind this all-powerful bank in San Francisco? From where in recent times has it been deriving its power to dehumanize people?

The California Military-Industrial Complex

Indeed, in what lies the main strength of the California oligarchic group?

Not in the personal capital of its members, millionaires and multimillionaires. Monetary capital merely awaits a profitable investment. Now immense defense production, which yields the greatest profit and at the same time provides special political influence, is concentrated under the control of the California group, particularly its leading bank in San Francisco. Without control over the production of weapons of mass destruction the Bank of America and its partners could not be compared today with the groups of the Rockefellers, the Morgans, the Mellons and the du Ponts and never would have penetrated beyond the doors of the White House.

The fact that of the top 10 dominant defense corporations of the United States no less than 6--Rockwell International, Lockheed Aircraft, McDonnell Douglas Aircraft (in part), Litton Industries, Northrop Aircraft and Hughes Aircraft--operate on the territory of California and, in spite of some rivalry with each other, constitute as if a unified whole, in fact also governed the career of the 40th U.S. President. If it had been otherwise, he most likely would have remained a mediocre movie actor, while the Bank of America would all the same have remained a provincial bank. Such are the laws of life of present-day American state-monopoly capitalism.

It must be taken into account that every oligarchic group in the United States developed due to the use of technical revolutions and important production changes. The Vanderbilts, Morgans, Harrimans, the Goulds and other American magnates of the past made a fortune on the construction and operation of railroads, the Rockefellers--on the increase of the consumption of petroleum as a result of the invention of the internal combustion engine and the diesel engine, the Mellons--on the increase of the consumption of steel, aluminum and petroleum, the du Ponts--on the use of chemical synthesis.

Thus arose the dynasties of billionaires from across the ocean. But as compared with the radical change which occurred in the middle of our century, when along with electronics nuclear missiles appeared, all the former opportunities of accumulating gigantic fortunes were left far behind. The fact that the rate of return on invested capital in defense production on the average is approximately 1.5-fold greater than in civilian production, decides everything for the monopolists.

When Robert Gross, the boss of Lockheed Aircraft, one of the leading Pentagon suppliers, was asked, why he engaged in the production of military aircraft, he responded: "This question is as old as the world. The Pentagon pays \$100 for each automatic rifle, \$7,600 for a military truck, \$29,000 for an armored personnel carrier, \$100,000 for an artillery piece. This is peanuts. My products are a different matter: a helicopter--\$300,000, a warplane--\$2 million. This is a profitable, popular commodity, gentlemen!" Gross did not say at that time that the production of missiles and other weapons of mass destruction is many times more profitable.

American economist Professor G. Stigler writes: "The maximum profit is the most powerful and most tenacious of all the forces which control the behavior of the

employer." This is true if you add to this the force of class consciousness. The "Ney Committee" in the United States, which conducted a special investigation of the revenues of defense corporations in the early 1930's, when weapons of mass destruction did not yet exist, established already then that a 100-percent rate of return was quite commonplace in defense production.

But it is a matter not only of this. The present arms market is in general the most extensive and the most convenient market that monopolists have ever had. The imperialist governments purchase nuclear missiles at any time, even when an economic crisis is raging in their countries and the sale of civilian goods is declining. The military-industrial monopolies, thus, enjoy a kind of immunity from market conditions. They get orders, in spite of everything.

In days of war the arms market expands at a 10-fold pace--once again regardless of the condition of the country. Thus, from 1938 to 1944 alone the California corporation North American Aviation (now Rockwell International) and the concern Lockheed Aircraft increased their sales by 70-fold, Douglas Aircraft--30-fold.

All this is having the result that not only industrial, but also bank capital is now interested to a greater extent than ever in defense production. The secret of the rapid growth of the Bank of America starting in the 1940's lies precisely in this. Here there is not simply the bank, but the bank which has entirely become a part of the main military-industrial corporations of the Far West of the United States. It is possible to assert that, in essence, this is a kind of nuclear missile bank.

Hence, and not only due to ties with influential clerical circles and the bountiful nature of California, its rapid ascent in the postwar years, which is unparalleled even in America. Back on the eve of World War II no one in the United States would have believed that any capitalist group could catch up to and surpass the magnates of Wall Street. Weapons of mass destruction, which threaten the existence of mankind, made this possible.

What share of its capital the Bank of America is spending for the needs of the defense industry, as well as how much it is gaining from this, are known only to its owners. But the very fact that bank loans and credits to defense corporations in the United States are steadily increasing, does not raise doubts. This increase is being promoted by the fact that defense corporations prefer to borrow money from banks, and not to obtain it from the public and, perhaps, from concealed competitors by the issuing of new stocks of their own enterprises.

Thus, for Lockheed Aircraft its own stock capital in 1973 accounted for less than 1 percent of the total amount of the balance sheet, while long-term bank credits made up 74.1 percent of its fixed capital. Here the bank loans can be exchanged at any time for stocks of the corporation, that is, can be converted into permanent sharing in it. In other words, in such instances the banks themselves are actually trading in arms.

Attracted by the same high profit in defense production, they are now investing in it incomparably more assets than ever before, be it in the form of direct capital investments or in the form of long-term credits. Here not only the banks' own capital, but also the assets transferred to them by the public are being invested. For this purpose the banks are even setting up special "investment corporations"

or are acting through agents. It is believed that the bank indebtedness of the military-industrial concerns of the United States covers from one-third to three-fourths of the total value of their production buildings and equipment.

After the war the Bank of America also acted in precisely this way. This led to such a close merging of military-industrial and bank capital in California that, in essence, it is already impossible to distinguish one from the other. What V. I. Lenin in 1916 wrote about the "personal union" of banks with large industrial concerns,* is being confirmed in practice in present-day California with particular clarity.

The Main California Defense Corporations

	Turnover in mil- lions of dollars		Number of workers and employees in 1979 (thousands)
	1969	1979	
Rockwell International.	2667	6176	114
McDonnell Douglas	3024	5279	83
Litton.	2177	4088	78
Lockheed.	2075	4058	67
Northrop.	561	1582	29
Hughes Aircraft		1500**	43

Thus, during the war and postwar years gigantic defense superconcerns developed in the United States, particularly in California.

It is worth speaking about one of them. In the present policy of the United States they are all playing a significant role, a much more significant one than the public at large knows. The history of the growth of some of them is similar to an adventure movie. Suffice it to briefly cite here the history of Lockheed Aircraft, which is now producing for the Pentagon neutron weapons, Trident missiles, transport planes for the "rapid deployment forces," anti-submarine airplanes and military transport airplanes for China.

The founders of the corporation, the Lockheed brothers, began in 1916 with a tiny business, which at that time no one took seriously: a small plant, which was located in a barn and produced single-engine wooden transport planes. At that time only a few hundred people were employed in the entire aircraft industry of the United States.

When the firm of the Lockheeds after some time went bankrupt, speculator Robert Gross bought it for \$40,000--the cost of a not very large store. At first he was also a businessman of the small-scale type, but he had considerable political flair, understood well in what kind of world he was living, sensed the approach of World War II, and was not mistaken. With the arrival of Gross the firm of Lockheed was completely changed over to the production of military airplanes.

* V. I. Lenin, "Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy" [Complete Works], Vol 27, p 337.

** The volume of defense orders.

Its representative traveled all over Western Europe and obtained a number of orders, include for 200 bombers from the English Government. When the war broke out, the backlog of Lockheed in 1 year increased by more than sixfold. Mass production was begun. From 1940 to 1943 the turnover had already increased 15-fold. During the war Lockheed produced 12,200 "Flying Fortress" bombers (designed by Boeing) and about 9,000 twin-engine "Lightning" fighters. The production of the Lockheed U-2 spy planes (now replaced by TP-1 airplanes) was also begun. The production power was expanded by nearly 20-fold, primarily by means of new plants which were built with government assets. The people paid.

But even this was a drop in the ocean as compared with what was begun when the United States in 1950 unleashed a war in Korea, then in Vietnam and began to speed up the unprecedented arms race which was aimed at the USSR.

In the late 1950's Lockheed began the production of Polaris missiles for American submarines. "The production of Polaris," Gross, the main owner of the firm, declared, "in the near future will exceed all the scales to which we became accustomed when building military airplanes." This did happen, although the common people in the United States did not understand very well what for.

In what did the secret of the sensational successes of Lockheed lie? By no means only in the high skill of the scientists and engineers hired by it. It was more important that back during World War II it became associated with the financial group of California's Bank of America.

In 1943 this bank granted it \$20 million in credit and after that time continued to assist its growth in every possible way. Gross entered into close relations with billionaire H. R. Hughes in Los Angeles, the head of an electronics corporation. All this opened the way for Lockheed to high-ranking government circles, on which the obtaining of orders depended.

Prominent Republican Party figure Herbert Hoover, Jr., formerly an assistant secretary of state, was included on its board. Another well-known Republican figure, C. Djukomen, in the future a financial patron of Nixon, intermingled with Gross.

In turn, Lockheed Board member C. Thomas, he is a member of the Republic Party National Committee, was appointed U.S. Secretary of the Navy, another board member, W. Berdens, was appointed Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Aviation. L. Root, a former special assistant of the deputy chief of staff of the Air Force, became a vice president of the firm. L. Russell, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which sanctions all the defense spending of the government, became good friends with Lockheed. Finally, W. Rayburn, at that time a chief of the CIA, began to be regarded as "the man of Lockheed." In the press reports appeared that the occupants of the White House frequently stayed at the luxurious villa of Lockheed owner Gross.

This was a kind of frantic leap-frog: it was difficult to comprehend where Lockheed was and where the government was. It was possible to speak of the "Lockheed-ization" of Washingtonian institutions. By the late 1950's about 100 prominent military officials, who "had retired," were already in the service of the corporation. Such "retirement" also became all but the main goal of their entire career.

A special brigade of "pushers" made up of 22 people was sent by the firm to Washington in order to maintain continuous contact with government circles. President Nixon himself, wherever needed, boosted the U-2 spy planes being produced by the firm. Apart from all this, as was subsequently revealed, a system of direct bribes was used on a most extensive scale.

The same thing was also done abroad, where tens of ministers, generals and right-wing politicians, who received so-called commissions, that is, the same bribes, were attracted to the clientele of the corporation in various countries. In Japan, for example, Prime Minister Tanaka himself was caught in the net. There was almost no major capitalist country in which scandalous exposures were not made later on.

In 1965 Lockheed received a \$500 million order for 58 C-52 assault airplanes--jumbo jets, each of which could hold up to 700 fully armed soldiers or 14 supersonic fighters. It was reported that by means of squadrons of C-52's the United States would soon be able in a few hours to transfer to any point of the world an entire military formation with all the materiel. Lockheed foresaw the Pentagon plan to create the "rapid deployment forces." In the 1980's it is producing ballistic missiles of a new generation for the submarine fleet.

At the same time it expanded its foreign market. The capitalist world was entangled by its branches and agents, a number of which were disguised. Jet fighters like the Starfighter, which soon proved to be defective, were built in accordance with licenses of Lockheed in the FRG, Italy, Belgium, Japan and Canada.

In 1958 Lockheed held eighth place among arms suppliers in the United States, in 1960--second place, in 1962--first place. Later, rivals began to surpass it: they acted even more cunningly and impudently. At the founding of the corporation one share in it cost \$.10, in the 1960's--\$800, 8,000-fold more. In 1953 alone the profit came to 74.1 percent of the internal capital.

The Pentagon became for the members of the California group something in the nature of the cave of Ali Baba. It has turned into a first-rank industrial force.

The matter, of course, was not limited to the merging of the Bank of America with Lockheed. The other leading aircraft and missile corporations of the state backed the conspiracy, and all of them also did not set a limit to their expansion.

Not that long ago the following calculation was made. In 1959 768 retired servicemen with the rank of colonel and higher were in the service of the 100 largest Pentagon contractors, in 1969 there were already 2,072. How many there are now, in the 1980's, has not yet been calculated. But the monopolization of the Pentagon as in the past is being accompanied by the Pentagonization of the monopolies. This has become a law of American society.

It is necessary to take into account another essential circumstance. The American (including the California) military-industrial complex is surrounded on all sides as if by satellites: the same, although not as large corporations in the other capitalist countries. This doubles its weight.

The American corporations are supplying weapons of mass destruction to the Pentagon, the West European corporations are supplying them to NATO. Both exchange licenses, jointly set higher prices and together recruit high-ranking politicians. It is noteworthy that the American defense corporations in many instances are directly involved in the West European defense corporations, while the latter are content with the role of junior partners.

Thus, for example, Lockheed maintains close relations with Messerschmidt, the West German aircraft and missile monopoly, which during the years of World War II supplied Hitler's Luftwaffe with 40,000 airplanes, and is now supplying the Bundeswehr and NATO. Messerschmidt, in turn, is involved with Euro-missile, the West German missile consortium, which was founded by the British monopoly British Aerospace and the French Aerospatiale. They are linked with the Dutch defense concern of Fokker, the Italian Macci, the Japanese Mitsubishi, and in West Germany itself with the oldest monopolistic groups of the Tissens and Krupps. All this is similar to some labyrinth, in which it is not difficult to get lost. But the members know the ins and outs.

Litton, a Los Angeles corporation, has plants in the FRG, England, Japan, Canada, Mexico, Italy, Switzerland and Sweden. Its president once declared: "It seems to us that Litton should be made a truly international company, and not simply an American company which operates abroad. It also seems to us that we should retain without fail control over the production technology.... By buying West German firms, we are simplifying the matter considerably. And the government of West Germany is satisfied, and we will feel at ease".

Northrop is by no means the largest of the American defense firms. Nevertheless it is also surrounded by a ring of partners in various countries. In the Netherlands, for example, the firm holds 25 percent of the stock of the firm of Fokker, in which not that long ago Prince Bernhard had shares. Even in Iran it held until quite recently 49 percent of the stock of the firm Iraq Aircraft Industries, in which money of the former Shah was secretly invested. Thus, the Iranian despot, on whose conscience are thousands of murdered and tortured people, was a direct, although secret member of the California military-industrial complex.

Consequently, a kind of international of merchants of death, which is controlled from San Francisco and New York, is in operation. In this way the defense firms from across the ocean are obtaining the opportunity to influence not only the policy of Washington, but also the policy of London, Bonn, Rome, Brussels, the Hague and Tokyo, under the former Government of France they also influenced to some extent the policy of Paris. This means that not tens, but hundreds of bourgeois figures in various countries are lackeys of the American weapons merchants.

That is how the California military-industrial complex looks. This, undoubtedly, is a powerful imperialist system. True, such major defense corporations as United Technologies, General Dynamics, Boeing, Martin Marietta (which specializes in the production of medium-range missiles) and others, which are located in other regions of the United States, remain outside its domains. Such giants with turnovers in the tens of billions of dollars as General Electric, General Motors and Ford, the peace-time output of which exceeds the military output, also stand alone. And still it is quite possible to say that the nucleus of the American defense industry has now been firmly established in California.

That is why the California financial group, having taken charge of this complex, was able to develop into a force which is capable of paving the way for its representatives to the helm of state of the United States. Its basic goal is to continue the arms race at all costs, to continue it ad infinitum and, consequently, to constantly strain international relations.

"As the months of the Reagan Presidency pass," THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote at the end of 1981, "weapons are becoming the basis of the bases of a broader and broader group of foreign policy problems. Diplomacy is finding expression primarily in the art of arms transfer. The relations (of the United States--E. G.) with the European allies are revolving around the deployment of American missiles. Weapons are being offered as a means of pacification in the Salvadoran civil war. And weapons qualify as a guarantee of friendship with China."

But in order to strain international relations and spur on the arms race, the big defense business needs a suitable political lever. Politics never lags behind economics. The right wing of the now ruling Republican Party proved to be such a lever for the California financial and military-industrial oligarchy.

The Right Wing of the Republican Party

The Bank of America is the financial base of the California oligarchic group; the military-industrial complex in the Far West of the United States is its industrial buttress. The political bulwark of the group is the Republican Party. Today this is, undoubtedly, one of the most aggressive bourgeois parties in the world, at this moment, perhaps, even the most aggressive.

The influence of its right wing in the policy of western imperialists has frequently been underestimated. Meanwhile precisely this wing over the course of many decades has more than once dominated in Washington and has promoted its candidates to the seat of the president. Presidents McKinley (1897-1901), Harding (1921-1923), Coolidge (1923-1929), Hoover (1929-1933) and Nixon (1969-1974) were right-wing Republicans.

It is not difficult to explain the domination of this wing. Beginning with the last third of the past century nearly the entire upper bourgeoisie of the United States began to support the Republican Party (which, it is true, nearly always did not prevent it from also financing the Democratic Party to be on the safe side). This had the result that the official leaders of the Republicans, as a rule, humbly took orders from the reactionary plutocracy. Only people, who were checked and rechecked by the local bosses and the "national finance committee" of the party, in which the direct representatives of big business were in charge, were almost always sent to Congress. This system operated for 100 years and operates to this day.

At one time some people believed that J. F. Dulles, Secretary of State under Eisenhower, who was known for his blunt anti-Soviet statements, was the moving spirit of the right wing of the Republican Party after World War II. The real leaders of the Republican right wing stood and stand to the right of the position of Dulles, who represented the comparatively more "moderate," although on the whole not less imperialistically minded oligarchic group of the Rockefellers.

From the standpoint of the California magnates, even such figures as Dulles were too cautious and not "offensive" enough. Reagan, Haig and Weinberger today, as is known, are behaving even more aggressively than Dulles behaved under Eisenhower in the 1950's.

Meanwhile there was a time when the American Republican Party could with every right have been considered a comparatively progressive, for a time even a revolutionary bourgeois party. Precisely the Republicans, who were supported by the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie of the northeastern states, by the farmers, workers and craftsmen, began in the 1860's the bold civil war against the slave owners of the South, at that time the most reactionary force in the country. In 1864 an appeal written by Marx, in which the founder of scientific communism welcomed the policy of the leader of this party, was addressed to none other than U.S. President Abraham Lincoln from the Republican Party.

All this is recorded in American history. More than 100 years ago the Republican Party had as if actually moved along the road of progress. But it is just as well known that after that, almost immediately following the murder of Lincoln, this party began to degenerate, gradually turning into the typical imperialist party as it is now. A kind of revolution, which pushed it far to the right, occurred within it. The former ideals began to disappear one after the other, turning into their opposite, although the phrases remained.

There was nothing surprising in this. As was already said, the Republican Party for several decades was seized, more precisely, was bought for the cash of big capital. It has also remained its exclusively property to this day. It is its party, and it is doing what it wants it to. No other forces are usually admitted to its leadership--neither in the center nor in individual states.

It is possible to assume that the overwhelming majority of the 70 American families, who have a fortune of \$100 million or more, today give preference to the Republican Party. Their representatives regularly reach an understanding with its bosses. Only the magnates of the large chemical business, the du Ponts, the Jewish bankers of Wall Street and--in part--the Morgans are usually closer to the Democratic Party than to the Republican Party.

The Rockefellers, the Mellons, the Hugheses, the Gettys, the Gianninis, the Chandlers, the Bechtels, the McCowns, the Knowlands and tens of other multimillionaires and millionaires invariably continue to finance the Republican Party and to keep under control those politicians of it, for whom an important government career is intended. These relations come to light most clearly every 4 years, when the leadership decides the question of the choice of a candidate for the White House.

It is noteworthy at the same time that in the past three decades a powerful united group of California bosses, who are close to the businessmen from the Bank of America and are linked with it to aircraft and missile corporations, have begun to acquire more and more influence in the upper ranks of the Republican Party. Recent conventions of the Republican Party have confirmed this again and again. The goal has been achieved both by intricate backstage machinations and by means of direct bribes.

In 1926 the Bank of America, which was initially called the Bank of Italy, appeared for the first time in the political arena within California, openly participating in the campaign in favor of the Republican candidate for the position of governor of the state. Its candidate was elected, and Giannini's bank immediately received permission to open 136 new branches in the state. But this was merely the beginning of actions on the scale of a single state. Following this the group of Giannini began to stubbornly force its way into the executive positions of the central Republican machinery.

After World War II a number of its influential figures, who had become rooted in it, joined the right wing of the Republican Party. The demand to wage an irreconcilable "cold war" against the USSR was their general platform. Among them were such well-known reactionary figures as W. R. Hearst, the richest publisher of several dozen gutter newspapers and magazines, who was close to the Bank of America; California politician W. Knowland, at one time the leader of the Republicans in the Senate; Herbert Hoover, a former assistant secretary of state and a board member of Lockheed Corporation.

Multimillionaire N. Chandler, the owner of the Los Angeles Republican newspaper THE TIMES MIRROR, who invested capital in the aircraft and petroleum industry, and shipbuilding magnate D. A. MacKown, at one time chairman of the federal Atomic Energy Commission, and then a chief of the CIA (he is a partner of California steelmaking monopolist Kaiser), joined the same group.

The political interests of the California oligarchic group, however, were not limited to positions in the western part of the United States. The influence of another, also comparatively young monopolistic group, which stood even farther to the right: Texas magnates, who got rich from the working of oil wells discovered in the southern part of the United States, was added to its influence in the Republican Party. The main one of them, Haroldson Hunt, who had approximately \$1 billion, could have been called a real fascist.

Hunt openly supported the severing of diplomatic relations with the USSR, the overthrow of the government of Castro in Cuba and an arms race that was not limited in any way. Precisely he and other multimillionaires in Dallas and Houston, who had grouped around him, stood behind the well-known anticommunist maniac and "witch hunter" Joseph McCarthy, when the latter after the war attempted to become president of the United States.

In May 1954 one of the Texas magnates to the question of the New York FORTUNE magazine, why do Texas millionaires support militant anticommunism, responded: "We all became rich quite quickly. And, I confess, except for money, nothing interested and interests us. But an increase of the forces of communism is being felt throughout the world. Why should we lose what we have achieved?"

The response of Texas billionaire Hunt to the question "Does it not worry you, Mr. Hunt, that your son, Lamar, lost in a year \$1 million on football bets alone?": "Of course, this worries me, for if things go on like this, Lamar will be bankrupt for sure in some 250 years."

A person who allows himself to speak in this way has considerable political influence in the United States, and the support by Texas bigwigs of the right wing of the Republican Party explains much in its strengthening.

Finally, after World War II Catholic clerical circles, which are very influential in California and several other states of the United States, undoubtedly, reached some kind of understanding with the representatives of this wing. As was already mentioned, the powerful Jesuit Order back in the 1920's deposited its money in the Bank of America. The Giannini family was also linked with the Catholic Church by personal ties.

It is true that Catholics in the United States for their most part usually voted for the Democratic Party. But what views authoritative American clerics not only from California held after the war, is evident, for example, from the statement made in the 1950's by Professor D. von Hildebrand of Fordham University, which was founded by the Jesuits in New York: "The threat of communism can be overcome only by means of force and, perhaps, by means of war. At this decisive hour God is calling for a heroic Christian life." Such abominable statements of some Catholic leaders undoubtedly contributed to the propaganda activity of the right wing of the Republican Party.

Its joining by all these circles doubled the strength of the California-Texas oligarchic group, and the struggle for the leadership of the party was waged in earnest.

In the late 1940's and the 1950's an adventurous attempt was even undertaken to establish in Washington something in the nature of an authoritarian regime. General Douglas MacArthur, former commander in chief of U.S. armed forces in the Far East, the moving spirit of the war in Korea and chairman of the board of the defense concern of Sperry Rand, was intended as candidate for U.S. president by the Republicans. His father, who at the beginning of the century won the Philippines for America, was buried in the military cemetery in San Francisco.

MacArthur was an adventurist of the most reckless type. In one of the interviews, which was kept secret before his death, he stated: "I could win the war in Korea in 10 days at most. I would drop 30-50 atomic bombs." He also reported on his intention to create from Japan to the Yellow Sea a belt of radioactive cobalt, so that "for a minimum of 60 years no one could enter Korea from the north."

Texas billionaire Hunt, an ally of the California group, was the backstage initiator of the venture to make MacArthur the president of the United States. The adventure with MacArthur turned out, however, to be too risky even for the Republican Party. Nevertheless it had already become clear at that time, to what the right wing of this party was able to agree, should the opportunity arise, in spite of the official principles of American bourgeois democracy.*

Thus, the right wing of the American Republic Party with centers in California and Texas, far from the former general headquarters in New York, had already stepped up its activity soon after World War II. In the mid-1960's, after the failure of the adventure with MacArthur, Senator Barry Goldwater, the owner of department stores, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, deputy chairman of the government Intelligence Committee and, finally, one of the close friends of the Bank of America, became their candidate for the White House.

* The question of whether a circle of Texas magnates was involved in any way in the murder of President Kennedy in Dallas in 1963, has still not been resolved, but it is hardly possible to rule out that things did go that far.

This was a no less openly ultra-right-wing figure than MacArthur. According to the testimony of Goldwater's sister, in his youth he did not read a single book, while the works, which were subsequently published under his name, were written by specially hired people. Goldwater had absolutely no understanding of international affairs. His views reduced to the demand to wage--at the least!--an unlimited, irreconcilable "cold war" and even frightened many supporters of Dulles.

In September 1962, for example, he stated: "Our first and most important task is to convince the enemy that we would rather send the entire world to the grave than to allow it to live under communism." The United States, Goldwater stressed, "should stop deceiving itself and its friends with disarmament talks." This sounds almost the same as recent statements of Weinberger.

Goldwater went so far as to demand the severing of diplomatic relations with the USSR, while for the settlement of the West Berlin question he proposed to use "small-scale nuclear weapons." Concerning the possibility of nuclear war, he said while speaking on television: "But what is special here?" In an article published in THE NEW YORK TIMES he declared: "Such a thing as peaceful coexistence does not exist at all." Such views completely suited the California group.

The stand of Goldwater on questions of domestic policy was characterized by the fact that the employees in the stores belonging to him were prohibited to join labor unions. He proposed in general to reorganize the Republican Party into a "conservative," that is, an openly right-wing party.

Such was the politician, whom the right wing of the Republican Party in the 1960's made its leader and began to destine for the role which in our times Reagan has been charged to play. The spirit of Goldwater also breathes in this party in the 1980's. Today he is also the head of the Senate Intelligence Committee.

Although Goldwater was not a Californian, the same California and Texas financial and military-industrial circles were his main support. The convention of the Republican Party in July 1964 was held in the citadel of these forces--in San Francisco, and precisely they at that time nominated Goldwater for president. The candidacy of the "moderate" Nelson Rockefeller was turned down by the votes of the Californians and their allies.

Goldwater at that time openly confirmed that in case of his election he would turn the helm of American policy sharply to the right in spite of the "moderates." On the eve of the convention of the Republicans he declared: "...The big banks and the financial aristocrats of the East Coast (New York!--E. G.) have almost always been able to manipulate the Republican candidate during the elections. They want to have an influence on foreign policy.... Since these circles know that they will not be able to control me, they are trying to oust me."

One of those, who in those days gave Goldwater considerable support, having turned over more than \$1 million to his campaign fund, was the wealthy Californian, the co-owner of the defense monopoly Litton Industries and member of the national finance committee of the Republic Party Henry Salvatore--the same person who 16 years later financed the campaign fund of Reagan. The owners of Lockheed Corporation, California newspaper magnate W. Knowland and Texas billionaire H. Hunt were other major contributors to this fund. For a number of years Bank of America director

R. Ash was the chairman of the Advisory Committee on General Governmental Policy, R. di Giorgio, a member of the executive committee of the same bank, was one of the main delegates from California to the Republican Party national convention. Republican Party Senate candidate and U.S. Ambassador to the Near East E. A. Johnston was also a member of the board. It was difficult to distinguish the party from the bank.

American journalist Drew Pearson, who was well-known in his day, wrote at that time: "From how Senator Barry Goldwater smashed the moderate wing of the Republican Party in San Francisco, it is possible to draw a most important conclusion: the control over this party has shifted from the houses of Morgan and Rockefeller to the impatient upstarts.... Changes have occurred in the economy of the country, and at the same time changes are occurring in political power. Today the Bank of America, and not Chase Manhattan Bank in New York is the largest bank in the world. Like this Texas with its missile and electronics industry has enormous economic superiority. New banks, new enterprises have appeared everywhere in the West and Southwest."

The no less authoritative bourgeois commentator S. Olson echoes Pearson: "...The Goldwater rebellion is a rebellion of new money against old money, the money of Texan Hunt against the money of Chase Manhattan Bank, the big money of the prospering regions against the big money of the old industrial states."

The late Democratic Senator Hubert Humphrey, who in 1964 was the U.S. Vice President, at that time noted that the Republican Party was "kidnapped" by a minority, which opposed the nuclear test ban, and called Goldwater a politician "with a heavy hand on the nuclear trigger."

The influential London newspaper THE OBSERVER went even farther in the appraisal of the leader of the right wing of the Republican Party: "Barry Goldwater is not Adolf Hitler, America is not Germany, 1964 is not 1929. It is unwise to make exact comparisons between these two situations. Nevertheless there is some alarming similarity. Goldwater does not have an official army which is trampling the law like Hitler's attack planes. However, in the United States there are groups, the ideas of which, for example, about communism, are reminiscent of the views of the Nazis, and there are groups which are organizing acts of violence. But Goldwater may prove to be a respectable person who will unite their extremism with the prejudices of simple Americans."

The right wing of the Republican Party was, thus, already in 1964 ready to seize power in Washington and to dictate its policy. Reagan is of the same roots as Goldwater.

An open clash between this wing and the "moderate" group headed by Nelson Rockefeller occurred at that time, at the convention in San Francisco. The key positions in the party machinery, including the position of chairman of its national committee, had already been seized by the right-wingers.

Still, the victory of the right-wingers at the convention in San Francisco did not give them at that time the desired results. Democratic Party leader L. Johnson was elected U.S. President in the 1964 elections. The "moderate" Republicans soon went

over to the counterattack and even forced the party national committee chairman, a protege of Goldwater, to resign.

Nevertheless the California and Texas magnates did not put down their arms. The lawyer Richard Nixon was their next favorite. His office was first located in the Bank of American building in the California town of Whittier. H. Perry, the head of a branch of this bank, and H. Hoover, a member of the board of Lockheed Corporation, were among his patrons. Nixon's wife was the daughter of T. Ryan, head of the aircraft and missile corporation, Ryan Aeronautical Company. Finally, General MacArthur, the idol of the reactionary military clique, was his ideal. This was sufficient. And this time the right wing of the Republican Party gained the upper hand.

In January 1969 Nixon, having replaced Democratic Party representative L. Johnson in the White House, became the 37th U.S. President, remaining in this position almost 6 years. Did the policy of the right wing of the Republican Party become under Nixon essentially different than under Goldwater? No, it merely assumed a somewhat more subtle nature.

It is true that Nixon in his times avoided expressing his goals as openly and roughly as Goldwater did, and at times even took steps in the direction of the normalization of relations with the Soviet Union. Thus, in May 1972 he concluded with the USSR a number of treaties and agreements, recognized the principle of the approximate parity of the United States and the Soviet Union, signed the SALT-I Treaty, a treaty on the limitation of antimissile weapons, a trade agreement and other documents. In June 1973 Nixon concluded with the USSR an agreement on the prevention of nuclear war. It is also true that Nixon at least did not break the agreements signed with the USSR. In this respect he nevertheless stood out among the right wing of the Republican Party, differing favorably from the current U.S. President.

Nevertheless the entire political game of Nixon was for the most part still aimed at the global advance of American imperialism. While holding the position of president until August 1974 the White House continuously attempted to strengthen the anti-Soviet forces both in the West and in the East.

The war in Vietnam was continued and in 1973 was halted only after the complete defeat of the American troops; the provocations against Laos and Kampuchea were stepped up; the talks with Maoist China were expedited. "The United States and its allies," Nixon declared back before he became president, "should under no circumstances reduce their forces." Nixon had to stop only when in 1974 in his tricks against the Democratic Party he failed in the Watergate scandal.*

It seemed that with the downfall of Nixon in 1974 it was possible to speak of the bankruptcy of the Republican Party. But to think this meant to underestimate its

* Even in the 1980's Nixon is still acting as an irreconcilable anti-Soviet politician. After arriving in the FRG in May 1980, in a conversation with a West German reporter he then and there declared: "World War III has already begun." To the question, what did he want to say by this, Nixon responded: "I want to rouse the West." Thus the right-wing Republicans are methodically poisoning the international atmosphere.

hidden forces. The 4 years of the government of Carter, who was unable to cope with the most important international problem, were sufficient to return these forces to power. The right-wing Republicans, who at one time considered Dulles himself to be too yielding, declared the Carter Government to be incapable of conducting U.S. foreign policy and became intimate with the military clique of the Pentagon, which insisted on the escalation of the arms race. In 1981 Ronald Reagan--a figure whose personal ties with the California Bank of America were no less strong than those of Nixon--became the new envoy of the right wing of the Republican Party in the White House.

It is frequently said that the Republican and Democratic Parties in the United States actually differ in almost no way from each other. As to their basic class and imperialist stands, this is, of course, correct. They both serve the same masters. Nevertheless it is possible to assert that the Republican Party, which is being guided by its present leaders, stands to the right of the Democratic Party. The most reactionary strata of American society support it. Its political strategy is almost always cruder and more primitive than the strategy of the Democrats. Its leaders often exceedingly poorly understand the international situation and at times in general know almost nothing about other countries. Its contacts abroad stretched to the most right-wing, more aggressive circles.

Thus, it is a matter not simply of the financial regrouping of the monopolistic forces in the United States after the war, which led to the advancement of the California and Texas magnates. It is also a matter of the sentiments of these forces, which are even more reactionary than those of the old bosses of Wall Street. Hence it is not by chance that Italian-American businessman Amadeo Gianini, the founder of the Bank of America, was from the very start an enthusiastic admirer of Mussolini and even a participant in big business in Italy of those years.

It is also not by chance that the same circles at one time supported the dictatorial aspirations of General MacArthur and to this day have contacts with the revanchists in West Germany and the ultra-right-wing military clique in Italy. The secret of the right wing of the American Republican Party lies in the fact that it is infected with profascism. As such this party headed by Reagan came to power in the seething United States in 1981. Such it remains to this day.

It is worth asking: How long will the reactionary financial and military-industrial oligarchy of the United States be able to control American politics? Will Americans understand in good time that all these machinations may in the end actually lead to World War III?

The 230 million inhabitants of the United States, those who today in their overwhelming majority, obviously, are still not properly informed about what is going on behind the doors of the White House, have to answer this question.

In the book "California: The Mirror of a Dream," which was published in the United States, it is possible to find the following words: "For 200 years we pursued something called the American dream. We were never able to determine precisely what this is, but the essence of the American dream is temptation, hope, the belief that all the wealth of the world is achievable, if not today, then tomorrow, that it is somewhere near by."

Is the wealth of the world near by present-day Americans? Does it look as if this wealth will be near by tomorrow? Or will something else be near by?

I remember another American book which was published 74 years ago: the science fiction novel "The Iron Heel" by Jack London. With amazing foresight he wrote about "the threat of the oligarchy (in the United States--E. G.), the frightening shadow hanging over the world.... Capitalism, which was ripe for decay, sent out another monstrous shoot--the oligarchy."

"The meetings of the Senate and House," London foresaw the future of the United States, "turned into a farce, into an empty formality. There some questions were still discussed, but now all this was necessary to lend to the commands of the oligarchy the semblance of legality.... In addition to the handful of superoligarchs, there still existed multitudes of oligarchs--a bit smaller, with a fortune of several million, they make up the cohort which is faithful to the superoligarchs."

I believe that it is hardly possible to call Jack London a dreamer. He did not dream and did not invent, but looked ahead perspicaciously.

We began as if by approaching the doors of the White House. Having passed through them, we immediately ran into powerful California and Texas magnates. From there we approached in a direct line the right wing of the American Republican Party.

Thus we reach current U.S. foreign policy: which in Europe is aimed in the direction of the preparation of a surprise nuclear strike against the European socialist countries and a military, economic and political offensive against the states of Western Europe, which in Asia is striving for a military alliance with China. To this we must add the plans of strikes against the Near East and Central America (Cuba, Nicaragua, El Salvador). This policy threatens the entire world.

It is difficult to get rid of the impression that all this is links of a single chain. The groups behind the doors of the White House are obviously attempting to encircle the entire world with it, and during this century.

And all the same it is clear: such plans can lead to nothing except a catastrophe for their authors and backstage moving spirits.

The 1980's are not the 1930's and 1940's, when the powerful community of socialist countries, which steadfastly support peace and disarmament, was not on the map of the world, and the peoples of the capitalist countries were not able to oppose the forces of war and fascism. Now there is hardly a capitalist country, in which mass antiwar and antinuclear demonstrations, in which hundreds of thousands and even millions of people are participating, have not occurred. The antiwar movement is also growing in the United States itself.

The fact is that in our times imperialism is no longer deciding arbitrarily the fate of the earth. And this fact is irreversible. The balance of historical forces is continuing to change not in favor of the present occupants of the White House. It is sufficient to ponder properly the events of recent decades in order to understand this.

It is important only that people would not await the future while twiddling their thumbs, lamenting their fate, but would act against the threat of World War III actively, each person wherever and however he can.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Znamya". 1982

7807

CSO: 1807/1

INTERNATIONAL

MILITARY PARITY WITH U.S. ESSENTIAL FOR PEACE DESPITE COST

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 45, Nov 82 pp 5-7

[Article by Boris Vesnin: "The Stronger Socialism, the More Secure Peace: 1917-1982"]

[Text]

Anniversaries of the October Revolution are for us Soviet people occasions when we all together—our vast nationwide collective born in the victorious days of 1917 and steeled in the ordeals of 1941 and the intensive labour effort of the five-year plans—join with a sense of deep gratification in surveying the path traversed. Needless to say, in keeping with the critical spirit of Marxism-Leninism, the socialist principle of self-criticism, we subject to meticulous examination what we have not yet managed to accomplish or what has not measured up to our expectations.

In short, the October holidays are for us days of pride in accomplishment and days of reflection. We look back at the past and drawing lessons from it ponder on the future. In this respect each anniversary of October is like the preceding ones. But this is not to say that each does not have its own specific features. Each prompts us to focus attention on some particular circumstance, some particular aspect of developments, some particular task confronting us. What are the specific features of the present, 65th anniversary of the October Revolution?

I

Perhaps the salient feature is that we now devote special attention to the international situation, its development, to the struggle to ward

off the threat of war and to carry forward and deepen détente.

Why this task has become so pressing is no secret to the readers of our journal. There now are in the world far too many danger points, actual or potential seats of war. The truly monstrous arms race which in itself is the source of an unprecedented danger of war is continuing. Above all, certain quarters, primarily the United States and a number of other countries of the imperialist world, are ceaselessly stepping up their efforts to whip up tension at all costs, to accentuate the confrontation with the socialist world and all other forces of socialist progress, to blackmail humanity with ever more sophisticated nuclear, missile, chemical and even space weaponry.

"Blackmail" is indeed the precise word for it. For the aggressive and reactionary forces of today are in effect acting like the highwayman of the hoary past who, holding his bludgeon over the wayfarer, presented him with the ultimatum, "Your purse or your life!" Today the aggressive imperialist quarters brandish a nuclear missile over humanity and say: "Return to the times of the undivided sway of capital or perish!"

Not always of course is it put quite so bluntly. But the substance of the policy represented by the recently proclaimed "crusade" against socialism is precisely that. The prime objective is to "roll back" socialism, to weaken it and, if possible, to com-

pletely cancel out the accomplishments of the October Revolution. Can we, the Soviet people and all other supporters of socialism, afford to ignore this? Of course not. More, we have no right to ignore it.

What is our Soviet, socialist reply to the imperialist blackmail and the threat presented to the very existence of our system, our state, and, indeed, the whole of mankind? Our reply is struggle. "The international situation," Leonid Brezhnev said on October 27, "obligates us to double and treble our efforts in the struggle to preserve peace, to reduce the threat of nuclear war hanging over humanity. In this struggle we must broaden co-operation with all for whom peace is precious."

Struggle, then, is imperative—struggle inspired by confidence in the success of the cause of peace, in the triumph of reason, in the peoples' instinct of self-preservation.

Sometimes we are asked: is your optimism justified? Are you not consoling yourself with empty hopes?

No, our view of the present situation, our faith in the triumph of reason, are realistic, for they are based on the objective realities of present-day world development.

One of these objective circumstances is the fact that détente has struck deep root in the life of the peoples.

In the course of the past decade many peoples, and primarily the peoples of Europe, had an opportunity to savour the benefits of mutually advantageous co-operation in diverse spheres and, in particular, in that of the economy. This circumstance to a large extent accounts for the sharp and perfectly legitimate reaction of West European countries to Washington's attempts to cancel out the fruits of détente, to uproot it and among other things, put an end to East-West economic co-operation.

Another objective factor in favour of détente is the growing role of the countries that have freed themselves from colonial oppression and, specifically, the role played by the non-aligned movement. The peoples

of this part of the world are becoming increasingly aware of the in-built connection between the onslaught on détente and campaigns of bellicose anti-Sovietism, on the one hand, and the activation of all manner of colonialist and neo-colonialist machinations, the fanning of armed conflicts and tension building in the Middle East, southern Africa, the Caribbean, Southeast Asia, and other regions, on the other. Is this not one reason why in the United Nations, where the developing countries make up the majority, a new international political climate is taking shape, a climate of resolute condemnation of imperialist aggression, of a quest for a just, constructive solution of urgent international problems?

Particularly noteworthy is the fact that the anti-nuclear movement has assumed unprecedented dimensions in many countries, the United States included. This movement brings together the representatives of practically all sections of capitalist society, including representatives of the big bourgeoisie. It is indicative that the fight against the nuclear threat has been joined even by generals and admirals, as well as by representatives of certain sections of the war business. This shows that all over the world there is a growing awareness of the danger of nuclear war, of the threat contained in the adventurist policy of the United States.

But of course the most important element in countering the imperialist policy of whipping up tension is as hitherto the peace policy of the Soviet Union and its friends and allies, the countries of the socialist community.

II

Above we have dwelt on the present world situation in general. If we take a closer look at it, it will be seen that the struggle between the two basic lines in world politics, a struggle that has been going on ever since the victory of the October Revolution and the adoption by the Second Congress of Soviets of Lenin's Decree on Peace, has now entered a

new stage. The characteristic feature of this stage is, as Leonid Brezhnev stressed, this: "The line of the U.S. and those who follow its lead is to heighten tension, to aggravate the situation to the maximum.... Our line is détente and the strengthening of international security. We shall not depart from this line, we shall redouble our efforts, retain the initiative in international affairs."

Thus on the one hand we see an activation of the aggressive forces of imperialism, which are out to mount a counteroffensive against the forces of social progress. That this is so is borne out by facts known to all.

And what about the forces of socialism? The revolutionary democratic states, the national liberation forces, the Communists, the working class? Can it be said that they are on the defensive or even retreating? No one will venture to say this.

The struggle for peace, like the revolutionary process, does not develop evenly. On one sector of the class struggle the forces of peace may advance, while on another sector they may be engaged in defensive action. But if we take the world picture as a whole, there are no grounds for speaking of the forces of social progress being on the defensive, and still less, of being in retreat.

On the contrary, socialism is unquestionably continuing its peace offensive, putting forward its initiatives in defence of peace, against the aggressive policy of imperialism. This offensive, far from slowing down, is continuing to gain momentum, as can be seen from the latest initiatives advanced by Leonid Brezhnev and socialist diplomacy in general. The whole world can plainly see that it is imperialism that is on the defensive.

And can the national liberation movement be said to be retreating, yielding its positions? Certainly not. Despite all the complexities and difficulties, it is continuing offensive action, though developments on the various sectors of the revolutionary

front may of course not follow an identical pattern.

And what about the working class of the capitalist countries? Has it dug in for a last-ditch stand? Of course not. It is engaged in hard fighting not only to hold on to the positions it has won, but to press forward.

In postwar history there have been periods (such as the cold war) when the forces of social progress were obviously on the defensive. Indeed, the socialist countries, the working class, the Communists, had to defend the ground they had gained. Some positions had to be yielded, but most of them were retained.

On the other hand, there have been periods when the revolutionary forces registered signal gains in their advance, while their enemy, imperialism, had to wage defensive action. That was the case, for instance, in the early seventies. (Recall the U.S. defeat in Vietnam, the revolutions in Chile and Portugal, and the liberation of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau.)

Today the situation falls into neither of the above two categories. The revolutionary forces are continuing their offensive, while imperialism is trying to mount a counteroffensive. It is a matter of the two contrary thrusts colliding.

We thus are witnessing an unusual situation in the world arena. What accounts for it? Clearly, the explanation lies in the specific features of the present alignment and balance of forces in the world.

In 1917 the alignment was simple. There was only one socialist country—Soviet Russia. The rest of the world consisted of capitalist, imperialist, countries divided into two hostile camps, and their colonies. In 1945 the alignment was altogether different. There were two world systems—the socialist and the capitalist. And the colonial periphery of imperialism began to crack and disintegrate. The situation in 1982 is again completely different. Besides the powerful socialist world there is an influential group of revolutionary-democratic countries developing

along lines oriented on socialism. Next to them a large number of former colonies which won independence comparatively recently and pursue different policies, but in the mass are opposed to imperialism and stand for the strengthening of their independence and for peace.

Lastly, there is a diminishing group of imperialist states inside which too differentiation is under way and internal discord is growing.

Surely the alignment of forces as such shows that the overall picture of international relations today is on the one hand far more multifaceted than it used to be, and, on the other, much more propitious for the cause of peace and progress than ever before.

III

The changes in the alignment of forces have been accompanied by changes in the balance of forces. The balance of forces is a category that reflects not only their actual disposition on the political map of the world, but also the relations between them, their relative economic, social and political weight.

As regards the balance of strength between socialism and imperialism, the two basic, diametrically opposite social entities in the international arena, its evolution since the October Revolution may be divided into three principal stages.

The first of these stages centred on the October Revolution in Russia, the Hungarian revolution of 1919 and other revolutionary movements in Central Europe, and the Mongolian People's Democratic Revolution of 1921. At this stage in the struggle between imperialism and socialism imperialism ceased to be the single worldwide system, though it unquestionably remained superior in strength. Socialism was still a fortress besieged by the class enemy.

The second stage was ushered in by the victory of socialism and the anti-fascist and democratic forces in the second world war (1945). Its main result was that imperialism ceased to be the sole world system. Beside it emerged the socialist world

system, and although world socialism has steadily gained in strength since then, for some time imperialism retained both military and economic preponderance.

The characteristic features of the third stage asserted themselves in the sixties and the early seventies. The main feature of this stage is the loss by imperialism of its preponderance of strength over socialism. In the economic sphere the socialist world accounts for more than 40 per cent of the total world industrial production. In the military-strategic respect, socialism and imperialism, the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., the Warsaw Treaty and NATO have reached rough equilibrium. In the international political sphere the initiative is unquestionably held by socialism.

The balance of strength in the world arena is not a matter only of the balance between socialism and imperialism. It is the balance between imperialism and all of its opponents taken together.

Taking all aspects of the matter into consideration it may be said that for the first time in history a situation has developed when imperialism and its opponents more or less counterbalance each other. This is a completely new situation. Clearly, all of its possible consequences and its possible effect on the course of developments in the various spheres of human endeavour and the different regions of the world are still far from having been thoroughly analyzed.

One thing, however, is clear: we are witnessing a completely new stage also in the development of international relations. The two powerful social waves colliding today in the world arena are the result of a new alignment and balance of forces which on the whole are immeasurably more favourable for the cause of peace and socialism than ever

before.

At times it is said that the new balance of forces, their equivalence, could (or should) result in a period of relative tranquillity. More, some say that the equilibrium of forces should provide the groundwork for nothing short of a compromise between the opposing sides. Now, the argument goes, the diametrically opposite characters of the two systems, their mutually exclusive social nature, can be forgotten (at any rate for a time).

Surely this is an illusory notion. First, and this is most important, equilibrium of forces in no way alters the class nature of socialism, imperialism, or capitalism. Their class nature remains what it always was. Actually, the social courses steered by the two world systems, far from drawing closer together, have diverged even more in recent decades.

Second, equilibrium of forces in every sphere of life is always attended by increasing complexity of the political struggle. For instance, as history has demonstrated time and again, in periods of equilibrium the confrontation of opposed parties or socio-political camps assumes especially active forms.

Any period of equivalence of forces is the result of a long process in the course of which one side has lost its former superiority and the other has achieved equality of strength. It is only natural that the former should seek to regain lost ground, while the latter is not willing to yield what it has gained.

It goes without saying that in the present situation the fact that the two systems are social antipodes makes itself fully felt in the

worldwide struggle between them. A distinctive feature of this situation is that socialism, having achieved military parity with imperialism, does not wish to press on further and gain superiority. Socialism does not need military superiority. For it does not seek the resolution of international contradictions through war, in the course of military collision. It does not believe in the "export of revolution." Nevertheless, imperialism, by virtue of its very nature, will continue to try to put an end to the present situation and regain its military superiority.

In this connection it is necessary to draw attention to a new problem—that of the political strategy and tactics in the fight for peace on the issue of military-strategic parity between the two social systems.

That it was not a simple matter for socialism to achieve this parity is common knowledge. To achieve it enormous exertion of effort and also self-denial on the part of the peoples of the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries were required. Socialism could of course have accomplished much more in peaceful construction had it not been essential to ensure equilibrium.

That socialism succeeded in doing this is a signal achievement. Essentially, it is a historic contribution made by the socialist community to the struggle for peace and social progress. For it is because of this change in the situation that the Western ruling quarters realized by the early seventies that there was no alternative to peaceful coexistence.

Today military equilibrium is a material barrier to the arch-aggressive ambitions of the U.S. and its partners, ambitions directed not only

against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, but against all revolutionary forces. Consequently, in the present situation the preservation of the military-strategic equilibrium between the two systems is a new and highly important element in the overall strategy of the struggle to prevent the outbreak of world war and to ensure continued social progress.

This is an issue with far-reaching political, ideological and, if you wish, theoretical implications. It is the concern of all fighters for peace, and, needless to say, primarily of the Soviet people. "In politics," Leonid Brezhnev has said, "not only words are needed. Policies are effective when they are backed by the real economic and military might of the state, the unbounded support of the people, firm friendship and militant alliance with allies and friends. All this we have. And we are working tirelessly in this direction."

As we mark the 65th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, we are gratified to see the fruits of our labours, which are an earnest of the fulfilment of our plans both as regards the heightening of the people's material and cultural standards and as regards the further strengthening of our country's defence capability. And this signifies the further strengthening of the material foundation of our peace policy, of the struggle waged by socialist diplomacy to remove the threat of nuclear war and to carry forward and deepen détente.

The stronger socialism, the more secure peace. The whole of post-October history has borne out this basic truth. The Soviet people, drawing due conclusions from the past, wholeheartedly working for peace, will do everything in their power to strengthen socialism, to increase the might of their Homeland. In this we see our duty to all the peoples of the world.

CSO: 1812/35

INTERNATIONAL

S.E. ASIAN EXPERIENCE SHOWS EVILS OF CAPITALIST ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 29 Nov 82 p 1

[Text] Capitalism is the Culprit

Poverty, economic and social inequality, unemployment, hunger, diseases, illiteracy and overpopulation remain the major problems of the current decade. This is pointed out in PRAVDA on November 28 by Vsevolod Kalinin in connection with the closing of the third session of the Committee for Social Development at the headquarters of the U.N. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) in Bangkok.

Life has most explicitly borne out the inconsistency of the political concepts put forward in newly-free states oriented on the capitalist path of development. This has been admitted by the participants in the session, who pointed out that the bulk of the people in the region are denied the rights to economic and social security, to normal conditions of life.

Among the oppressed majority, the heaviest burden is borne by women, young people and children. Women are discriminated against in labour and pay, education and vocational training. The younger generation is viewed not as a reserve of a creative labour force, but as a social burden, the commentary says, this attitude makes young people take the path of crime, the crime rate growing from year to year. Children's labour is widely used in the region. In Thailand alone, a total of 200 thousand children at the age of 11 to 14 are employed at factories, according to official figures. The rights of children and young people are violated everywhere in the capitalist world.

The facts cited at the session have exposed capitalism as being the main culprit of the sufferings of the peoples. This is the conclusion drawn by an overwhelming majority of the participants in the session. (PRAVDA, November 28. Summary.) Translated by TASS

CSO: 1812/30

INTERNATIONAL

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN GREEK COLONELS' SEIZURE OF POWER ALLEGED

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 2 Dec 82 pp 3-4

[Article under the rubric "APN Informs and Comments"]

[Text] Now that Athens is the venue of Greek-US negotiations on the future of military bases in Greece, a campaign is gaining momentum all over the country for the immediate dismantling of the bases on the ancient land of Hellas. Soviet political observers point out that this problem is really like a thorn in the flesh, a constant nuisance causing the pain and anger of the Greek people, APN political analyst Vladimir Katin writes. Indeed, one can understand the Greeks--the presence of US military bases in their territory is no present for the country; it is a permanent threat to the normal life of society, a danger to peace in a vast region--in the Mediterranean, in the Balkans, and in the Middle East.

It certainly means infringement on the country's national sovereignty, on national pride. Apart from the purely moral negative aspects of the matter, US military presence spells for the Greeks a real danger of intervention in their domestic affairs. Examples are not far to seek. Let us recall the putsch of "black colonels," which, as admitted by competent US officials, was organized and backed by US and NATO agents.

In the event of developments in the country in a direction undesirable to Washington, the US intelligence service and military command will render support to those forces, persons and organisations which are now opposed to the government of Socialists.

US military presence can very seriously complicate Greece's relations with its neighbours, specifically, with the Arab countries, with which Athens traditionally maintains friendly ties. For instance, US bases in that region, Greece included, were used for staging provocations against Libya, for rendering support to Israel in the war against Lebanon.

The Soviet Union cannot help taking into account the presence of US military bases and nuclear weapons on Greek territory. Moscow has more than once declared that it is ready to give guarantees that it will not use nuclear weapons against those countries which do not have such weapons on their territory. This directly applies to Greece, too, with which the Soviet Union builds relations on the basis of mutual respect.

During the meeting Andreas Papandreou, the Greek Prime Minister, had recently with Nikolai Tikhonov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, the sides noted the existence of good opportunities for further productive cooperation. The USSR is ready for this, and certainly, if US nuclear weapons are not targeted on Soviet territory from Greece, this cooperation will be much deeper and more meaningful.

(APN, December 1.)

CSO: 1812/37

INTERNATIONAL

IMPORTANT THEMES FOR 37TH UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION SURVEYED

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Sep 82 p 6

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences Vl. Petrov: "Political Will--That Is What Is Needed"]

[Text] On the eve of the 60th anniversary the Soviet Union, at the basis of whose Leninist foreign policy lies the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, is firmly resolved at the forthcoming 37th Session of the UN General Assembly to do everything possible for the success of the cause of peace. As L. I. Brezhnev recently pointed out in a discussion with UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar, the USSR has invariably supported the efforts of the United Nations, which have been aimed at the guarantee of international security and the development of cooperation among states in conformity with the provisions of the UN Charter.

The next, 37th Session of the UN General Assembly opens in New York on 21 September. The delegations of 137 countries are to examine a wide range of international questions and to express their attitude toward vital problems of the present. The agenda numbers a little less than 150 items. But it is understandable that in the forefront among them are the questions of the prevention of nuclear war, arms limitation and the elimination of centers of international tension.

Today the watershed in world politics lies precisely in the questions of war and peace. This truth found confirmation during the 2d Special Session on Disarmament of the UN General Assembly, which was held last year. Along one side of the watershed are the forces which support the taking of immediate, truly tangible steps on the prevention of nuclear war. There is here the coincidence of the fundamental interests of the socialist countries and the majority of nonaligned countries, the realistic basis in the approach of those western states, which do not wish to risk their own fate and the achievements of detente for the sake of the hegemonic ambitions of the American "leader," is traced here. Along the other side of the watershed are the aggressive imperialist circles, first of all the United States, which are relying on the arms race and the development of reckless scenarios of a "limited" or "protracted" nuclear war and have started to dream of "gaining the upper hand" in the military field. By their doctrines and practical deeds they are pushing the world to the nuclear abyss.

A clear and unequivocal statement of the UN member states in favor of the constructive settlement of the questions on the agenda of the commencing General Assembly session, unquestionably, would promote the reduction of the nuclear threat. The most important direction of the international efforts for this purpose is indicated in the Declaration on the Prevention of a Nuclear Catastrophe, which was adopted on the initiative of our country at the 36th General Assembly Session. This document proclaims as the gravest crime against mankind the first use of nuclear weapons and calls for the halt and turning back of the nuclear arms race by joint efforts, by honest and equal negotiations. Or there is another initiative of the USSR--the obligation, which it assumed unilaterally, not to use nuclear weapons first. This means that if the other nuclear powers were to follow our example, the likelihood of the outbreak of a nuclear war would be reduced to naught.

The forthcoming session is called upon to outline steps on the quickest possible implementation of the USSR proposal, which is being considered at the United Nations, on the conclusion of a World Treaty on the Nonuse of Force in International Relations. For this is a reliable means of ruling out the use of any weapons for the purposes of aggression. Such a long ripe measure would meet the interests of the security of both nuclear and nonnuclear states. However, it, like the elimination of the danger of the first use of nuclear weapons, is being blocked by the United States and its allies. Washington and the militant circles of NATO are opposing in every possible way everything that could limit the possibility of the pursuit by them of a policy of threats and dictation with respect to other countries and peoples. What is this if not direct conflict with the UN Charter and UN decisions?

A forceful statement of the General Assembly in favor of the practical implementation of measures of arms limitation and disarmament would also promote the strengthening of peace and international security. The proposals on the elaboration and gradual implementation of a nuclear disarmament program, which were made by the Soviet Union at the 2d Special Session on Disarmament of the UN General Assembly, as well as the proposals of many other states on the curbing and halt of the nuclear arms race are creating a solid basis to halt, at last, the buildup of the most dangerous means of waging war. Our country is acting in the same direction, by seeking specific, really appreciable understandings, at the talks being conducted between the USSR and the United States on strategic arms limitation and reduction and on nuclear arms limitation in Europe.

The problem of halting and banning nuclear weapons tests has been at the center of UN attention for many years. The new Pentagon programs of the qualitative improvement of nuclear arms, the development and deployment of even more dangerous types and systems of them, and Washington's rejection of trilateral talks (with the participation of the USSR, the United States and England) on a total nuclear test ban only confirm the urgency of UN efforts in this area. Many states, as the work of the Disarmament Committee has shown, resolutely support the need to bring the talks on this problem to a successful conclusion and call upon all nuclear powers to assist the drafting of the corresponding international agreement.

The problem of the banning and elimination of chemical weapons will be one of the most urgent at the session. A draft of the basic provisions of the appropriate convention, which was introduced by the Soviet Union at the 2d Special Session on Disarmament, takes into consideration the positions of other states and makes it

possible to make decisive progress in the achievement of an international agreement. The conditions and atmosphere for the banning of chemical weapons are ripe--only a serious approach and a sincere desire to find mutually acceptable understandings are needed.

The international situation urgently requires of the UN member states the stepping up of efforts in all directions of the drive for the prevention of a nuclear threat and the curbing of the arms race. Taking into account the nature of the decisions being made by the United Nations, it is impossible to expect, of course, that the next session will change at one stroke the state of affairs in the sphere of disarmament. However, it is capable of giving impetus to the talks under way and to the achievement at them of concrete results. It should call for the reopening of the broken-off negotiations and the start of new ones, which are capable of lessening the global threat which comes from the arms race. There are no insurmountable objective obstacles on this path. Recently a group of authoritative scientists, who were united in the "Pugwash" movement, confirmed anew that "from a technical point of view, disarmament is feasible; only political will is lacking." It is important for the UN potential to be completely mobilized for the fight against this disease, which has afflicted several capitals of the NATO member countries.

Along with arms limitation and reduction, which would provide material guarantees of peace, the present situation requires the taking of steps on the creation and strengthening of the political, legal and other bases of international security. At the session, of course, the discussion will touch on questions of the just political settlement of conflicts and the curbing of acts of aggression and arbitrariness, which are a direct result of the reliance on brute force in the policy of the United States and its most zealous assistants. The assembly is called upon to defend resolutely the universally recognized norms and principles of peaceful, equal relations between states and to require their rigorous observance.

The partner of the United States in "strategic cooperation" and the Camp David agreement, Israel, having amended the UN Charter and UN decisions, committed in essence with the complicity of Washington aggression, which is unparalleled in brutality and bloodiness, against Lebanon, a sovereign country which is a UN member, and the Palestinians. Justice itself requires that the crimes of the Israeli militarists, which have developed into the present genocide, be sternly condemned and that the immediate fulfillment of the UN decisions on the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon and from all occupied Arab territories be demanded.

The task of implementing the basic principles of the solution of the Near East problem, which were approved by the UN General Assembly, is acquiring particular urgency.

These days the attention of peoples has been drawn to the new important initiative of the Soviet Union. Advanced by L. I. Brezhnev, it sets forth in concentrated form a means of a comprehensive, truly just and genuinely lasting settlement for the Near East. The Soviet leader emphasized that a just and lasting peace in this region can and should be based on principles which conform to both the norms of international law and the specific decisions of the UN Security Council and the UN General Assembly, which pertain to this problem.

The new questions being placed on the agenda by states reflect for all their ambiguity the aspiration to extinguish the hotbeds of tension and to protect

peace. Thus, for example, the desire to achieve a halt to the fratricidal war between Iran and Iraq, which is advantageous only to imperialism, the quickest possible settlement by negotiations of the conflict in the South Atlantic on the basis of UN decisions on the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands and the granting to the people of Puerto Rico of the opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination and independence is quite understandable. It must not be permitted that the people of Micronesia would be deprived of this right and that the UN decisions aimed at the guarantee in the shortest possible time of the genuine independence of Namibia would be avoided.

The session will undoubtedly reflect anew the sharp confrontation of the two lines of world politics and the complexity of the present situation. The General Assembly, however, is not simply a kind of mirror of the processes taking place in international life. It is a factor of positive influence on these processes, when the will of states and peoples for peace finds expression in its activity. Precisely with respect to the contribution of the United Nations to the accomplishment of this main task--the assurance of a firm peace and security on earth--the peoples appraise its effectiveness and judge its authority. It is important for the forthcoming session to actively promote the identification of all the available means of preserving peace.

7807

CSO: 1807/170

INTERNATIONAL

SOVIET-AFGHAN SEMINAR ON CENTRAL ASIAN CULTURE HELD IN DUSHANBE

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 21 October 1982 page 2 carries a 200-word article titled "The Study of Ancient Cultures." The article reports on an October 20 conference in Dushanbe on "Abdurakhman Dzhami (1414-1492) and the Culture of the Peoples of Central Asia." The conference participants included orientalist from the USSR and from Afghanistan.

NEW PUBLISHING HOUSE ESTABLISHED TO TRANSLATE RUSSIAN, FOREIGN WORKS

[Editorial Report] Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 30 October 1982 page 4 carries a 300-word article titled "'Rainbow' Publishes" by G. Matusov. The article reports on the establishment of a new "Rainbow" publishing house in Moscow, which is charged with translating non-Russian works into foreign languages and foreign works into Russian. It notes that among the first publications of this new publisher will be a Turkmen book to appear in Dari for young readers in Afghanistan.

JAPANESE ATTENTION TO CENTRAL ASIAN DEVELOPMENT REPORTED IN TAJIK PAPER

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 13 October 1982 page 1 carries a 200-word article titled "Enormous Transformations." Datelined Tokyo, this TASS dispatch reports that the Japanese paper XSAHI has given extensive and positive coverage of the social and economic transformation of Soviet Central Asia in the period since 1917.

SOVIET-AFGHAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK IN NORTHERN AFGHANISTAN REPORTED

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 27 October 1982 page 4 carries a 1000-word article titled "The Meeting of Archaeologists of the USSR and France" by N. Negmatov. The article describes a recent meeting of Soviet and French archaeologists concerned with the history of ancient Baktriya held in Dushanbe. In the course of this discussion, it reports on Soviet-Afghan archaeological work in Northern Afghanistan. These expeditions have taken place under the direction of I.T. Kruglikova and V.I. Sarianidi of the USSR Institute of Archaeology.

CSO: 1830/83

INTERNATIONAL

SOVIET FINNISH THEATER CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

[Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 November 1982 page 3 carries a 500-word article titled "The Finnish Theater at the Half-Century Mark" by Yu. Shleykin. The article reports on the history of the Finnish theater of Karelia and notes that it has been awarded with the Order of Friendship of the Peoples on its 50th anniversary.

CSO: 1800/362

FRENCH SCHOLAR ATTACKED FOR WRITINGS ON WORKER, PEASANT ACCESS TO EDUCATION

[Editorial Report] Ashkhabad KOMSOMOLETS TURKMENISTANA in Russian 12 October 1982 page 2 carries an 8,000-word (full page) set of articles under the general title "Argument: Slander Under the Mask of 'Objectivity'." The various articles and letters dispute the finding of the French sociologist B. Kerblay that children of Soviet workers and peasants have less access to higher education than children of the Soviet intelligentsia.

CSO: 1800/346

INTERNATIONAL

BRIEFS

FRG MEDICAL INSTRUMENT MANUFACTURERS IN BAKU--Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian on 21 November 1982 publishes on page 4 a 100-word AZERINFORM report on a visit by two West German "specialists on the manufacture of stomatological instruments and equipment," Hans Pashun of Siemens AG and Hans Korbes of Bego. They visited the republic Ministry of Health and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. [Editorial Report]

CSO: 1807/48

NATIONAL

NEW WORK ON PARTY'S STRUGGLE AGAINST NATIONALISM

[Editorial Report] Moscow KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 46, 10 November 1982 page 3 carries a 1000-word article titled "The Policy of Brotherhood of the Peoples" by A. Sidorov. The reviewer praises a new work titled "The Struggle of the Leninist Party Against Nationalism and For Internationalism" (in Russian, Moscow, 1982) and notes that the party has opposed not only "great-power chauvinism" but also "such reactionary nationalist tendencies and doctrines as pan-Islamism, pan-Turkism, and zionism." According to Sidorov, the chapter on the struggle against nationalism during World War II is particularly interesting because it shows how strong the unity of the Soviet people had become.

ROLE OF LITERARY EXECUTORS IN COUNTRY DESCRIBED

[Editorial Report] Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 48, 1 December 1982 page 6 carries a 1300-word article titled "The Circle of Memory" by Veniamin Kaverin. The article describes the work of the commission on the literary legacy of Yuriy Tynyanov, which Kaverin heads. He outlines the archival, organizational, and publications activity of this body and reports his hope that the collected works of Tynyanov will soon be published.

CSO: 1800/378

NATIONAL

DROBIZHEVA PRAISES NEW WORK ON MULTINATIONAL SOVIET WORKING CLASS

[Editorial Report] Moscow KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 46, 10 Nov 82 p 3 carries a 600-word article titled "Our Working Class" by L. Drobizheva. The article reviews a new book by P. Timofeyev, "The Formation of National Cadres of the Working Class of the USSR" (in Russian, Moscow, 1982). The reviewer praises the book for its treatment of the history of this question and especially for its discussion of the role of the working class in the formation of socialist nations.

CSO: 1800/357

RERIKH COLLECTION OF ORIENTAL ART ON DISPLAY IN MOSCOW

[Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 November 1982 page 3 carries a 250-word article titled "From the Collection of Yu. N. Rerikh" by T. Kalugina. The article reports on a new exhibition in Moscow of Oriental art which was collected by Yu. N. Rerikh (Roerikh), a longtime emigre who headed the Institute of Himalayan Studies in India from 1930 to 1942 and who returned to the USSR in 1957.

CSO: 1800/360

REGIONAL

UZBEK MINISTER DISCUSSES CONTRIBUTION IN NONCHERNOZEM

Tashkent PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN' in Russian No 8, Aug 82 pp 43-47

[Article by I. Dzhurabekov, minister of land reclamation and water management of the Uzbek SSR: "Uzbekistan--Nonchernozem"]

[Text] When the Communist Party outlined a broad program for development of the Nonchernozem, the land reclaimers of Uzbekistan, true to their international debt, were among those who went to the Novgorod Oblast. Already in the beginning of November 1974, the Shimskiy specialized mechanized column "Tashkent-1" was created. The nucleus of the new collective became the 19 people from Uzbekistan, 11 of whom were members of the CPSU. It was not easy for them: a harsh winter, cold and rainy spring and autumn, shortage of housing. But as always, the communists headed an intensive struggle filled with difficulties. Showing examples of labor valor, attracting with their excellent example, they led the developers.

After the first "landing" the second and third arrived on the ancient soil of Russia. The subdivisions of the Ministry of Water Management of the republic continued to send skilled workers, experienced engineers and technicians to the Novgorod Oblast. In 1975, on the base of the specialized mechanized column "Tashkent-1" the trust "Uznovgorodvodstroy" was set up. The expanded front of land reclamation work was guaranteed by powerful equipment: single-bucket and multiple-bucket excavators, bulldozers, stump pullers, brush cutters, tractors, truck cranes, transport trucks of different brands, tractor trailers and much more arrived here. The specialists of Uzbekistan visited all regions of the oblast; together with the local party and soviet organizations determined the primary tasks and discussed plans for the future.

The implementation of comprehensive land melioration of the Nonchernozem requires the most efficient use of capital investments, all the available technical resources, and selfless intensive labor. The people of Uzbekistan displayed labor enthusiasm multiplied by skill and experience from the first day.

A subject of special concern of the leadership and party organization of the trust "Uznovgorodvodstroy" became the increased output from the excavating equipment, and decrease in its idling. For this purpose methods of organizational and educational work were used, among which a large place was given to correct organization of Socialist competition, broad propaganda and introduction of the leading methods of labor.

Filled with a feeling of high responsibility, understanding well their international debt, the people of Uzbekistan by 1976 has already done enormous work in the Novgorod Oblast. They assimilated almost R 4 million of capital investments, put into operation 167 hectares of irrigated land, dried land on an area of over 2,000 hectares, constructed 3700 m² of housing, and started to build the sovkhos "Tashkentskiy."

The people of Novgorod themselves suggested naming the new farm at the name of the capital of Uzbekistan. Thus the beginning of a good tradition symbolizing the friendship between the Russian and the Uzbek peoples, Uzbekistan and Novgorod was started. In the Nonchernozem, new settlements, farms and streets built by the Uzbek land reclaimers have begun to be named after the cities of our republic. The vegetable growing sovkhos in the Tashkent Oblast has been named after ancient Novgorod.

After completion of the construction, the sovkhos "Tashkentskiy" will become a modern agricultural-industrial enterprise with 3,000 hectares of reclaimed land. Here a dairy farm, mechanical shops, garages, closed warehouses for mineral fertilizers, a set of greenhouses, and modern storage for agricultural products will be built. The sovkhos settlement will be decorated with buildings of cultural-general institutions, hospitals and a kindergarten. All conveniences have been provided in the houses: gas, central heating, water supply, sewer and telephone. Thus the boundaries between the city and the country are being erased more and more.

At the end of 1975, the trust "Uznovgorodvodstroy" received the Volotov PMK-13 from the association "Novgorodmelioratsiya." This made it possible to expand the field of activity in up to three regions. The collective of the trust further continued to gather strength and to increase the work front. Now 6 of its construction subdivisions are based in the Novgorod, Shimskiy, Soletskiy, and Volotov regions of the oblast.

The collective of the trust has done an especially lot of work to develop the Nonchernozem in the 10th Five-Year Plan. Contract work was fulfilled for almost R 50 million, over 16,000 hectares of dry land were opened, about 35,000 m² of housing was constructed. All the areas opened by land reclaimers have been successfully introduced into the agricultural turnover swampy Novgorod lands which have been empty for centuries are now yielding high and stable harvest. Thus, for example the kolkhozes and sovkhoses of the Shimskiy Rayon, which received 5,640 hectares of dry lands and reclaimed areas have significantly increased the harvest and the gross collection of agricultural products.

Among the components of successful work of the people of our republic in the Nechozem, a special role belongs to socialist competition. Labor competition for increased efficiency of production, publication of its results, all possible conservation of material resources, improvement in the quality of work are given enormous attention by the party and trade union organizations of "Uznovgorodvodstroy." Conditions have been developed and approved for competition among the subdivisions. They stipulate measures for moral and material incentive. The results are summarized every quarter.

Successful fulfillment of the tasks for giving patronage help to the Novgorod Oblast depends primarily on the provision of the construction organizations with personnel. The party and Komsomol organizations are focusing constant attention on this question. In the years of the 10th Five-Year plan alone, more than 12,500 people were sent for permanent and temporary work in the subdivisions of the trust "Uznovgorodvodstroy" but there are still not enough specialists. The main reason is their high interchangeability. The shortage of housing has a perceptible effect, many people are still living in trailers.

This why the main concern of the party organizations of the trust and its subdivisions is improvement in the working and living conditions of the developers. Production bases have been set up in the lower organizations. Housing and objects of cultural-general purpose are being intensively built. Now the subdivisions of the trust have 40,000 m² of housing, well-built dormitories with 700 places, and kindergartens for 300 places.

Measures are being taken to improve the cultural-general services. In all the populated areas of the Novgorod Oblast, where subdivisions of the trust are dispersed, shops are working and all the specialized mechanized columns have model cafeterias. Field machine tools have been organized at the large facilities. The working and living conditions are constantly being improved. The political-educational work done by the communists has a positive effect: the turnover of personnel diminishes more with each year.

The party organizations are focusing a lot of attention on education of the youth. In 1978 100 qualified builders came on Komsomol business trips in the team imeni 60th anniversary of the Komsomols.

Komsomol brigades were formed from the team members. They were sent to the most important sections. Full of enthusiasm and youthful energy, having broadly expanded socialist competition, they are achieving high results. Among the best Komsomol leaders is the head of the drainage brigade Tursunpulat Rasulov. His name was put on the oblast honor board for high production indicators, and the people of Novgorod elected him a deputy to the rural council.

The team imeni 60th anniversary of the Komsomol is constantly being supplemented with volunteers from the subdivisions of the Uzbekistan Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Management. In order to improve the skills of the new arrivees, and to train the future developers in the new construction processes, they are sent for training in the local rural professional-technical schools.

The communists are making a weighty contribution to introduction of the leading forms for organization of construction production, in particular, brigade and section cost accounting. Last year alone, many sections of "Uznovgorodvodstroy" worked according to the method of N. Zlobin. They assimilated construction-installation operations for a sum of about R 3 million. The highest specific weight of work done according to the method of cost accounting is found in the specialized mechanized column "Tashkent-1," the specialized mechanized column "Tashkent-2" and other subdivisions.

These collectives achieve high indicators because of creative approach to work. Thus, the chief engineer of the specialized mechanized column "Tashkent-1", communist Mikhail Alekseyevich Kim after studying the possibilities for improving the effectiveness of the brigade contract under conditions of the Nonchernozem suggested that it be used in a line. The essence of the innovation is that the brigades take a contract not for a set of work as a whole, but for individual types. Because of switching to this method, the construction periods were reduced by one-third with high work quality. Specialization made it possible to improve the use of mechanisms. I would like to note that the party organization of the specialized mechanized column "Tashkent-1" which is headed by Viktor Mikhaylovich Sergeev, is one of the most active. It has 40 communists, many of whom are initiators of valuable initiatives.

The most important reserve for improving the rates of land reclamation construction in the Nonchernozem, and growth in labor productivity is elimination of the seasonal nature in conducting work, and organization under winter conditions. This will make it possible during the year to effectively use equipment, material resources, to guarantee more uniform occupation of the work force, and prepare the front for the summer period. The communists have shown a lot of initiative here.

The leadership of the trust, the primary party, trade union and Komsomol organizations are focusing a lot of attention on mass-political and educational work, improvement in the cultural level of life of the workers, and correct organization of their free time. Evenings of international friendship and athletic competitions are held. Lectures are organized on urgent topics, literary evenings and film viewings. In the collectives of mechanized columns, youth vocal-instrument ensembles have been set up. Athletic-mass work has been set up well. Three football teams have been created. Championships of the trust for different types of sports are held regularly.

As a result of the labor and political upsurge induced by the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the developed socialist competition, in the first year of the 11th Five-Year Plan the collectives of the trust successfully coped with fulfillment of the planned assignments. Not only were the quantitative but also the qualitative indicators high. In 1981 "good" and "excellent" evaluations were given to 75 percent of the facilities. High Quality of work at the facilities of the specialized mechanized column "Tashkent-1" were noted from the results of the all-union inspection of construction quality. The commission of the USSR Gosstroy awarded the collective of the column the diploma and awarded it a monetary prize. The collective of the specialized mechanized column "Tashkent-1" was awarded the challenge

red banner of the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Management for high indicators of last year. The specialized mechanized column "Tashkent-2" won the challenge red banner of the Novgorod CPSU obkom, oblispolkom, oblsovprof and the Komsomol obkom. Forty-eight workers of the leading professions of the trust "Uznovgorodvodstroy" were awarded the sign "Shock Worker of the 10th Five-Year Plan," and 15 people were awarded the sign "Shock Worker of Communist Labor."

Among the best developers is the leader of the drainage brigade Viktor Frayert who fulfilled 2 annual assignments during the year. His comrades in the column, competitors in the socialist competition, brigade foreman of the drainage workers Vladimir Movetkin and Tursunpulat Rasulov, excavator operators Yuriy Matveyev and Ibragim Turdyev, bulldozer drivers Valeriy Savchenko and Pavel Loginov, Zagidulla Shaydulyn and Farid Raskhutdinov, carpenter Aleksandr Mozhayev and plasterer-painter Lidiya Kuznetsova.

The Uzbek developers of the Nonchernozem made a confident start in the second year of the 11th Five-Year Plan. They overfulfilled the plan for 6 months for the general contract. Work is successfully continuing for construction of the Sovkhoz "Tashkentskiy." But the May (1982) CPSU Central Committee Plenum which confirmed the food program of the country for the period up to 1990 placed even more important tasks before the collective of the trust "Uznovgorodvodstroy." They are faced with fulfilling a large volume of contract work on objects of development of the Novgorod Oblast. For construction of the Sovkhoz "Tashkentskiy" they have to assimilate over R 20 million and put into operation facilities for production of 26,000 T of vegetables, 5,500 T of milk per year, and implement a vast program of water management construction. About 22,000 hectares of dried and over 2,000 hectares of irrigated lands will be transferred to agricultural production. Cultural-technical work will be done on an area over 6,000 hectares.

In fulfilling the instructions of the party and government regarding measures for securing personnel in agriculture, the leadership, party organization of the trust have outlined for the 11th Five-Year Plan a number of measures aimed at improving housing and cultural-general conditions of the workers and employees.

This year is the year of the famous anniversary of our multinational motherland. One of the most important results of the 60-year path of the USSR, one of the main sources of our strength is the strong, indestructible friendship of all the peoples in our country. Speaking at the triumphant meeting in Tashkent dedicated to the awarding to the republic of the third Order of Lenin, the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: "The CPSU Central Committee highly values, for example, your active participation in realizing the comprehensive program for development of the Nonchernozem. This, comrades, is a good example of the display of internationalism in work."

In response to these inspiring words of Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, the land reclaimers of Uzbekistan will do everything in order to successfully fill the set plans. Together with the workers of agriculture of the Nonchernozem, they will apply all their efforts in order to obtain high harvest of agricultural crops on the reclaimed lands, and at the same time make a worthy contribution to fulfillment of the country's food program.

COPYRIGHT: "Partiynaya zhizn'", 1982.

9035

CSO: 1830/20

REGIONAL

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT VIEWED BY LATVIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 1 Oct 82 pp 1, 3

[Text] The USSR Food Program, approved by the May (1982) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, stipulates a reinforcement of the role of science in the development of the whole agricultural industry. Scientists from the whole country have responded to this with great responsibility. They have adjusted their plans and have undertaken a solution of the most urgent agricultural problems. A general assembly session of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences, which took place on September 30 in Riga, discussed broadly the tasks of science in the execution of the Food Program in our republic. Taking part were directors and employees of scientific research institutes, teachers of higher educational institutions, agricultural specialists, and representatives of social organizations.

Among those in attendence were comrade I. A. Anderson, Ya. Ya. Vagris, V. I. Dmitriyev, Yu. Ya. Ruben, V. A. Chemm. Present also were deputy chairmen of the republic's Council of Ministers V. M. Krumin' and M. L. Raman, and the heads of departments of LaCP Central Committee V. S. Klibik and Kh. Ya. Nagla. The opening speech to the gathering was given by the President of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences, Hero of Socialist Labor, academician A. K. Malmeyster. He observed that the Food Program is the most important integral part of the USSR Communist Party's economic strategy in the next ten years. Scientists are called to make a substantial contribution to the intensification of agricultural production, to assist in Party and government measures for supplying the population with food products. Scientific research assumes special importance in the field of economics and organization of the agricultural industry, genetics and breeding of plants and animals, technology of field-crop cultivation and laying-in of fodder, storage of agricultural products, efficient utilization of natural resources.

The LaSSR Academy of Sciences is coordinating the division "Nauka" [Science] in the realization of the Food Program in the republic. Participating in it are the collectives of various branch scientific and higher educational institutions. The academy on its part has also concentrated its attention on the main problems directly related to the development of agriculture and animal husbandry. The Economics Institute, the Microbiology Institute imeni A. Kirkenshteyn, the Biology Institute, the Organic Synthesis Institute, the Wood Chemistry Institute, the Inorganic Chemistry Institute, the Physics and Power Engineering Institute, and the Polymer Mechanics Institute are very fruitfully engaged in their solution.

The results of many investigations are already finding practical application and are producing a big economic effect. But we must not remain content with what has been achieved. It is necessary to eliminate completely such shortcomings as petty objectives and dispersion of forces, and to move steadfastly ahead in the chief, cardinal directions of scientific search. And, of course, the obligation of scientists is to strengthen their ties with the economy and to achieve the quickest introduction of completed developments. This first of all concerns those which promote the speedy fulfillment of the Food Program.

In this speech, the Minister of Agriculture of the republic, corresponding member of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences K. A. Shpogis, dwelt on the tasks of agriculture and science which ensued from the resolutions of the May (1982) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. He stressed the fact that the republic in the 11th Five-Year Plan is faced with increasing sharply the production of agricultural products. For this it is necessary to overcome the consequences of the extreme weather conditions of 1978-1980, as a result of which the agrochemical and physical properties of the soil deteriorated, land-reclamation systems suffered, and the biological value of seed material decreased. The realization of the Food Program will above all depend on the stabilization of labor resources, leader cadres and specialists from all fields, on assuring stability in agricultural production taking into account the characteristics of local climate, on the priority development of crop-growing as the fodder base for livestock breeding, and on the augmentation of soil fertility. The solution of such complex problems cannot do without the help of science which has become a real productive force in agriculture.

Specialists and scientists have outlined and are already implementing a whole combination of measures to increase grain production. This presents a large task. The same can be said about potato production. The productivity of this crop in our republic has remained low from year to year. The main reasons for this lag have been studied and efforts are being taken to correct the situation in accordance with the resolutions of the May 1982 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

The protection of the potato from disease is of great significance. Because of this it was necessary to apply a new imported fungicide. It has been highly effective. But the price is also very high. It is thought, said the speaker, that scientists from the Organic Synthesis Institute and other institutes of the Academy of Sciences are able to develop a more effective means. The creation of such a preparation in a short period of time would be an important contribution to the realization of the Food Program and to saving in the economy of the republic and the country.

Using modern methods and achievements in biology it is necessary to derive an earlier food variety of potato which, by all indications, especially by its quick maturing and gustatory qualities, would surpass the "Early Priyekul'skiy" variety. It is also necessary to shorten the harvest time of grain and sugar beets and to raise the proportion of fast-maturing crop varieties in the general cultivation area. The task, of course, is not easy but it must be coped with by agricultural biologists and selectionists.

A highly pressing problem is the preservation of grassy fodder. The traditional measures applied under the weather conditions of the republic do not

always permit the laying in of first-class hay by industrial means. And major nutrient substances are lost through the siloing process. Our scientists should take this into consideration also. Rural workers are waiting for them to create a preservative which with minimal expenditure of energy and materials would guarantee the preservation of grain in its complete state. Then we will attain a considerable increase in meat and milk from the same amount of grown fodder.

The speaker also characterized some other tasks facing scientists. He noted the necessity of further reinforcement and expansion of cooperation between the research and planning institutes of the LaSSR Ministry of Agriculture and the institutes of the republic's Academy of Sciences. Their interaction should be especially precise on the levels of control and introduction of joint developments.

"Biotechnology and the Agricultural Complex" is the title of the speech given to the session by academician of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences M. E. Beker. Biotechnology as an applied science, he said, is widely used in bread-baking, in the production of lactic products, in the fermentation process, in preservation of food and fodder. For fifteen years now in the Soviet Union, the microbiological industry has been developing quickly, providing agriculture with microbe synthesis products such as lysine and vitamin concentrates, fodder antibiotics, enzymes and other preparations.

In the Latvian SSR a shortage of albumen is sharply felt, especially in hog and poultry breeding. A part of this deficit may be made up from production by the microbiological industry, and in particular from albumen concentrates made of local raw materials. The role of bacteriological improvements, growth stimulants of field crops and biological means of protecting plants is growing ever bigger. There is a real possibility of gaining valuable products from waste materials of sugar, alcohol, starch, flour-grinding and other sectors where agricultural raw materials are processed.

The biotechnological processes aimed at increasing protein in animal fodder are now being introduced directly in the kolkhoz "Uzvara" in the Bayskiy rayon. An experiment undertaken at the initiative of the Institute of Microbiology imeni A. Kirkhenshteyn will allow future utilization of the results at all farms. This work is conducted in the framework of a comprehensive scientific program--"Transformation of Photosynthesis Products." Scientists are also intensely engaged in the problem of the utilization of colossal, constantly renewed resources of cellulose raw material. It will be possible to convert it into proteins, alcohol and other necessary products.

Furthermore, in the Institute of Microbiology imeni A. Kirkhenshteyn methods of fermenting fluid farm waste are being examined. A new direction in research has set itself the task of attaining high-quality organic fertilizer as well as protecting the environment from pollution. The speaker further described the main features of future biotechnology which will be enriched by the achievements in molecular biology, bio-organic chemistry and genetic engineering. It offers the tempting possibility of utilizing in agricultural practices microbe, plant and animal cells that have undergone artificial changes.

Participants in the session familiarized themselves with new proposals by the Economics Institute of the republic's Academy of Sciences, where the model of rayon agro-industrial associations [RAPO] was first set up. This topic was addressed by corresponding member of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences A.A. Kalnyn'sh. At the moment, he said, RAPOs are organized in all 26 rayons of the republic. Similar set-ups exist also in Estonia and Georgia. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet approved the experience accumulated in this area in the Talsinskiy rayon in Latvia and the Abashskiy rayon in Georgia and recommended its wide dissemination in the country.

Workers at the Institute summarized the theoretical and scientific-practical studies of RAPO, which allowed them to start devising the principles for further development of the agricultural complex on the republic level.

The ways in which the Latvian Agricultural Academy is participating in the fulfillment of the Food Program was explained by its rector, corresponding member of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences V. G. Timofeyev. The higher educational institution extended the topics of its work and actively included itself in comprehensive research based on the plans of the USSR Government Committee on Science and Engineering, the LaSSR Academy of Sciences, the ministries and departments. Every ruble spent on research already pays for itself three times in return. The Agricultural Academy on the whole is preparing about thirty projects relating to the tasks of the Food Program. They are being handled by scientists--economists, land-developers, specialists in land-reclamation, agronomists, zootechnicians, and many other specialists. They are improving technical means and technological processes applied in agriculture and are contributing substantially to the intensification of livestock breeding.

Research is being conducted in various directions. Much attention is given to the long-range aspects of social development of kolkhozes and sovkhozes, to the questions of stabilization of labor resources, the efficient use of fodder, and the improvement in reliability of electrical equipment in the village. All this accompanies the improving the educational process and training and raising the qualifications of rural economy specialists. The institutes of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences plan to expand student work-practice. Furthermore, the VUZ collective expects that the scholars of the Academy of Sciences will henceforth take an active part in the educational process.

As far as future scientific research goes, it is necessary to eliminate some basic problems. Above all this concerns the methods of fighting losses in agricultural output. So far the science of the republic has not, unfortunately brought us notable victories in the storage of potatoes, vegetables and fruit. It is necessary to summarize Soviet and world experience in this area, and to work out serious, sound proposals.

Corresponding member of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences V.S. Gromov gave a speech "The Chemistry of Wood--for Agriculture." He touched on some long-range questions relating to strengthening and improving the fodder base for livestock breeding. The biomass of trees, remarked the scientist, is composed primarily of 70 percent carbohydrates, and the green parts also contain vitamins, fats, amino-acids and other valuable substances. This is an important

potential source of fodder and food products. However, wood lends itself with difficulty to fermentative hydrolysis, and it is necessary to create effective means of hydro-thermal, chemical, radiation, mechanical, and other means of treatment of such raw material with the object of raising its nutritional value. Scientific search, widespread both in the USSR and abroad, is aimed at this.

The Soviet Union is the first country in the world to have created a large-scale hydrolysis industry. In particular, it turns out protein yeast, a highly valuable addition to the fodder of agricultural animals and fowl. The development of this field depends to a great extent on the perfection of industrial technology and equipment. In this field, extensive theoretical and applied analyses are being conducted by the Wood Chemistry Institute, where the so-called "Riga method" of hydrolysis was born. In order to implement its advantage in practice, many scientists and project-construction organizations of the country have united their forces. At this time in the Valmierskiy rayon, at the agro-chemical complex "Zilayskalis," a model industrial shop is being built. When construction is completely finished, the production of protein yeast from surface layer little-decayed peat will be started first of all.

It is extremely important to raise the coefficient of utilization of wood materials, including such waste as hydrolysis lignine. Latvian scientists have established that it is possible to get high-quality organic-mineral fertilizer from it. Their experimental lot successfully passed the first experiments. As the experiments showed, this same waste from the hydrolysis industry can serve as a source of a whole line of other products. Such is the far from complete list of possibilities presented by wood chemistry.

A talk was given in the session by corresponding member of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences V. K. Bauman, who talked about the contribution of scientists of the Biology Institute of the republic's Academy of Sciences in increasing the productivity of agricultural animals and plants. She dwelt on successes in molecular biology and genetics, which are already giving practical results in field-crop cultivation and livestock farming. The institute's staff has worked out specific recommendations for optimizing the mineral nutrition of plants, the application of effective biological methods of fighting insect-pests, the utilization of microelements, vitamins, hormones and other biologically active substances.

Corresponding member of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences E. R. Lukevits gave information about new preparations which are being created to aid agriculture by scientists of the Organic Synthesis Institute.

The session of the general assembly of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences passed a wide-ranging resolution about the tasks of science in the realization of the Food Program in the republic.

9331
CSO: 1800/131

REGIONAL

NEW SCIENTIFIC ECONOMICS SOCIETY CREATED IN TAJIKISTAN

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 14 August 1982 page 2 carries a 300-word article titled "A New Scientific Society." The article describes the formation of a new scientific economics society in Tajikistan. The purpose of the society is to coordinate work, assist in planning, and conduct propaganda designed to increase the introduction of scientific knowledge into practical work. This new group is part of the All-Union Scientific Economics Society.

TAJIK WOMEN'S JOURNAL CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 3 September 1982 page 2 carries a 1600-word article titled "Through the Bright Fates of Women" by Kh. Mukhiddinova, the editor in chief of the Tajik-language journal "Zanoni Todzhikiston" ("Women of Tajikistan"). The article commemorates the 50th anniversary of the journal and notes that it is devoting an increasing amount of space to moral and ethical questions and to ideological education.

NEW TAJIK-LANGUAGE BOOK ON STRUGGLE WITH BASMACHI PUBLISHED

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 15 November 1982 page 4 carries a 200-word article titled "On the Soldiers of the Revolution" by S. Makhkamov. The article reports on the publication of a new Tajik-language book titled "Soldier of the Revolution" about Olim Pochoyev, who was an active participant in the fight against the basmachi.

TRADITION FAMILY PATTERN RETAINED IN CENTRAL ASIAN ACADEMIC FAMILY

[Editorial Report] Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 15 November 1982 page 3 carries a 1000-word article titled "A Family of Scholars" by T. Khydyrov. The article reports on a Turkmen family, four of whose sons have become prominent Soviet scholars. It notes that the opinion of one of the sons remains especially authoritative for the extended family of approximately 50 people.

TELEVISION SERVICE EXPANDED INTO TYAN' SHAN REGION

[Editorial Report] Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 2 November 1982 page 3 carries a 100-word report titled "Television in Tyan' Shan." The article reports that this region of Kirghiziya now can receive two programs of the Moscow service.

GORNO-BADAKHSHAN CITY CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 27 October 1982 page 2 carries a 1700-word article titled "The City in the Heart of the Mountains." Published with an illustration of the main city square, the article describes the city of Khorog in Soviet Badakhshan on its 50th anniversary. It gives details on city services and the role of this city in the cultural life of the region.

MUSLIM NATIONALITIES SWEEP HERO-MOTHER AWARDS IN TURKMENIA

[Editorial Report] Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 25 Nov 82 p 3 carries a 2500-word announcement of a Decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium awarding the title of hero-mother to 112 women in the Turkmen SSR who have borne and raised ten or more children. 107 of the 112 have both first and last names characteristic of the Muslim nationalities of Soviet Central Asia; the other five have first names which could be Slavic but last names which are also typical of those found in Central Asia.

CSO: 1830/88

END